

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The SMMART Trails Coordination Draft Summary Report was mailed in April, 1997, to approximately 1,350 individuals, organizations, and agencies (see Table 5 for the list of the organizations and agencies that received a copy). Additionally, copies were made available at several local libraries and at offices of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. The Executive Summary of the Draft Report was provided to 500 agencies, organizations, and media outlets along with a press release announcing the public open houses. Additionally, attempts were made to post the Executive Summary of the Draft Report on the World Wide Web but due to unanticipated technical difficulties, this was not achieved during the publicized comment period.

Two open houses were held May 7th and 8th, at the William O. Douglass Outdoor Classroom in the Franklin Canyon area and Agoura Hills High School, respectively. The format of these meetings were as follows: a welcome from the National Park Superintendent, an introduction to the project by the project coordinator, and short presentations made by representatives of the six Action Teams. During the second hour, the group dispersed to visit stations around the room where the teams had maps and additional information displayed and were available to answer questions and receive comments. Written comment sheets were provided to participants to obtain their input as well. Over the two nights, 94 people attended in addition to SMMART Action Team members.

Comments Received

A total of 115 comments were received from the public. These included written comments provided during the public open houses and letters received during the comment period. Three public agencies provided comments, including the Conejo Open Space and Conservation Agency, Cal Trans, and the Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains. Seven organizations provided comments, including the Conejo Valley Cyclists, the Concerned Off-Road Bicyclists Association, the Malibu Park Homeowners Association, the Santa Monica Mountains Trails Council, Trails 4 All, the Triunfo-Lobo Community Association, and VTN, West, Inc. Comments were received from 105 individuals. Table 6 lists the individuals who provided written comments on the draft summary report.

Handling of Comments

Each Action Team was responsible for reviewing and addressing comments received relevant to their team report. Teams generally either modified or clarified portions of their reports, added additional information or recommendations, or referred issues to the implementing agencies for their consideration without recommendation. Some comments were received that were beyond the scope of the team's purpose or

were considered, but rejected by the team. The remainder of this section contains a summary of how each Action Team addressed the comments directed to their particular team's reports followed by excerpts from the comments.

No summary statistics are provided about the comments in the final report other than the total number of respondents. Although the written comment sheets distributed at the public open houses requested people identify themselves as "primarily an equestrian", "primarily a hiker", "primarily a mountain bicyclist", "primarily a trailrunner", or "other", team members felt that inclusion of the adjective "primarily" skewed the results. Many comments were received by letter and trail user identification could only be interpreted by the contents of the letter. Team members felt that including statistics about identified trail user categories could be misconstrued as a survey sample of the entire trail using population instead of a self-selected few. Also, statistics could make it appear that respondents were "voting" for particular options or recommendations. The excerpts from the comments are instead provided below to allow readers the opportunity to see the range of views offered on each team report. Comments were also not attributed to the individual or organization writing so that the teams, and report readers, would grapple with the issue at hand, rather than personalities.

Table 5. Draft Report Distribution List - Agencies and Organizations*Public Agencies and Governments*

Angeles National Forest US Forest Service
 California Coastal Commission
 California Coastal Conservancy
 California Department of Fish and Game
 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
 California Department of Parks and Recreation
 California Recreational Trails Committee
 California Regional Water Quality Control Board
 California Resources Agency
 California State University, Los Angeles - Department of
 Biology
 CalTrans
 City of Agoura Hills
 City of Beverly Hills
 City of Calabasas
 City of Camarillo
 City of Hidden Hills
 City of Malibu
 City of Oxnard
 City of Port Hueneme
 City of Santa Clarita
 City of Santa Monica
 City of Simi Valley
 City of Thousand Oaks
 City of West Hollywood
 City of Westlake Village
 Conejo Open Space Conservation Agency
 Department of the Interior, Solicitor's Office
 Las Virgenes Municipal Water District
 Los Angeles County
 Minerals Management Service
 Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority
 National Park Service
 Native American Heritage Commission
 Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department
 of Agriculture
 Naval Air Weapons Station, Pt Mugu
 Rancho Simi Park and Recreation District
 Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
 Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area
 National Park Service
 South Coast Air Quality Management District
 Southern California Association of Governments
 Topanga-Las Virgenes Resource Conservation District
 Tujunga Ranger District, Angeles National Forest
 University of California at Los Angeles, American Indian
 Studies Center
 University of California at Los Angeles Architecture
 Information Center
 University of Southern California
 Ventura County
 Ventura County Flood Control District

Organizations and Businesses

Agoura-Las Virgenes Chamber of Commerce
 Ahmanson Land Company
 Archdiocese of Los Angeles San Fernando Mission
 Center
 Archeological Resources Management Corporation
 Archeology Advisory Group
 Audubon Society
 Basin Blues Running Club
 Bridle Path Homeowners Association
 Brotherhood of the Tomol
 CABO
 Calabasas Chamber of Commerce
 Calabasas Highlands Homeowners Association
 Calabasas Park Homeowners Associations
 Calabasas Posse
 Calabasas Village Mobile Home Park
 California Historical Society
 California Indian Council
 California Office of Tourism
 California Trail Users Coalition
 California Trails and Greenways Foundation
 Camp Josepho
 Candelaria American Indian Council
 Canoga-Owensmouth Historical Society
 Cheseboro Road Homeowners Association
 Chatsworth Historical Society
 Children's Lifesaving Foundation
 Chumash Coastal Band
 Citizens Association of Saratoga Hills
 Coastwalk Creek
 Cold Community Creek Council
 Cold Creek Docents
 Community Hills Association of Saratoga Bicyclists
 Concerned Off-Road Bicyclists Association
 Conejo Cyclists of Crystal Cove
 Conejo Association of Realtors
 Conejo Future Foundation
 Conejo Valley Chamber of Commerce
 Council for a Green Environment
 Corral Canyon Homeowners
 Deer Springs Homeowners Association
 Earth Science
 Environmental Coalition
 Equestrian Trails Inc, Corral 36
 Equestrian Trails, Inc, Corral 22
 Federation of Hillside and Canyon Homeowners
 Fountainwood Homeowners Association
 Friends of Runyon Canyon
 Friends of Satwiwa
 Greater Mulwood Homeowners Association
 HEART
 Harmony Keepers

Table 5. cont.

Heal the Bay
 Hidden Hills Community Association
 Indian Cultural Group
 International Mountain Bicycling Association
 Las Virgenes Historical Society
 Las Virgenes Homeowners Federation
 Las Virgenes Village
 Leonis Adobe and Plummerhouse
 Liberty Canyon Homeowners Association
 Los Angeles Audubon Society
 Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce
 Los Angeles City/County Native American Indian Community
 Los Angeles Conservation Corps
 Los Angeles County Bicycle Advocates
 Los Angeles County Trails
 Los Angeles Orienteering Club
 LA FORCE
 Malibu Creek Docents
 Malibu Cultural Resources StudyGroup
 Malibu Historical Society
 Malibu Lake Mountain Club
 Malibu Lakeside Community Association
 Malibu Park Homeowners
 Malibu Pony Club
 Malibu Trails Association
 Monte Nido Valley Property Owners Association
 Morey/Seymour Associates
 Mount Wilson Bicycle Association
 Mountain Bicycle Unit
 Mountain View Estates Homeowners Association
 Mountains Conservancy Foundation
 Mountains Education Program
 Mountains Restoration Trust
 Mounted Assistance Unit
 Mulholland Scenic Corridor West Homeowners Association
 National Parks and Conservation Association
 Nature Nursery Walk
 North Ranch Mountain Bikers
 Oakbrook Chumashi Corporation
 Old Agoura Homeowners Association
 Old Topanga Homeowners Association
 Over The Bars Bicycle Club
 Palisades Beautiful
 Parklands Association
 Pense Archaeological Consulting
 People for Parks
 Point Dume Homeowners Association
 Potomac Investment Associates
 R.P. Strathrean Historical Park
 Rancho Simi Trailblazers
 Sage Ranch Park
 San Fernando Valley Bicycle Club

Santa Clarita Runners
 Santa Monica Audubon Society
 Santa Monica Bay Restoration
 Santa Monica Convention and Visitors' Bureau
 Santa Monica Mountains Natural History
 Santa Monica Mountain and Seashore Foundation
 Santa Monica Mountains Trails Council
 Santa Susana Mountain Park Association
 Save Open Space
 Seminole Hot Springs
 Shell Oil Company
 Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter
 Sierra Club, Conejo Group
 Sierra Club, Griffith Parks Hikes Committee
 Sierra Club, Inner CityOutings
 Sierra Club, San Fernando Valley Group
 Sierra Club, Santa Monica Mountains Task Force
 C. A. Singer and Associates
 Southern California Edison
 Southern California Indian Centers. Inc
 Southern California Institute of Natural Resources
 Southern Chumashi
 Southern OwlClan
 Sullivan Canyon Riders
 Surface Transportation Policy Project
 Surfrider Founddton
 Sylar Trails
 Sylmar Chamber of Commerce
 Temescal Canyon Association
 Trails-4-All
 Tree People
 Triunfo-Lobo Association
 The Trust for Public Land
 Topanga Arch Consultants
 Topanga Association for a Scenic Community
 Topanga Bango and Fiddle Contest
 Topanga Canyon Docents
 Topanga Natural History State Farm
 Trail Runners Club
 Trancas Riders and Ropers
 12th Council District, Transportation Management Foundation
 Ultra Ladies
 Viewridge Owners Involved in the Community and Environment
 The Wilderness Institute

Table 6. Organizations and Individuals providing Written Comments on the Draft Summary Report

Gary Adams	Peter Kelly	Debra Tennenaid
Sandra Adams	SusanKrohngold	Jess Thomas
Christian Altenbach	Lewis Landau	Jon Tice
Richard Anibrose	Mark Langton	Tun Tommasino
Mark Avery	Jean Lawrence	Trails 4 All
Michael Bass	Laurie Laurence	Triunfo-Loco Community
William Becker	Leonard Leichnetz	Association
J. Brad Benarm	Barbara Lestak	Melissa Truchsess
Dan Bemstein	Evelyn Levme	VTN West, Inc
Eric Bishop	Lou Levy	Bridget Walsh
Ron Blasman	Michael Logan	Duffi Walton
Lynn Bradley	Malibu Park Homeowners	Ralph Waycott
Paul Brennan	Association	Mary Ann Webster
Mary Budnekeyer	Candance Martin	Ron Webster
Barbara Burnett	Jack Matalon	Karen Wolf
Myles Butner	Stephan Matsuda	JW Wowoskiski
Cal Trans	Lewin Minter	Larry Zahorecz
Becky Cariste	Kelly Moms	
James Carson	Bruce Morrison	
Norene Charnofsky	Susan Nelson	
David Chiabauda	Lon Neumann	
Concerned Off-Road Bicyclists	James Nickla	
Association	Douglas Ogilvie	
Conejo Valley Cyclists	Darid Osorio	
Conejo Open Space and	Linda Palmer	
Conservation Agency	Roger Pelote	
Ed Daniels	King Philips	
Ted DePass	Rich Pinder	
Joseph Dillman	Irene Pohl	
Chris Doner	Peter Pohl	
Kevin Donnelly	Dan Popper	
Howard Drew	Rick Recht	
Burton Elliott	Resource ConservationDistrictof	
Tara Farkash	the Santa Monica Mountains	
Sean Farley	Patrick Reynolds	
Peter Gandell	Bradley Rice	
Bob Garsen	Bonnie Richland	
Grant Gerson	Ray Riley	
Ruth Cerson	Tom Robbins	
Eric Gressler	Kem Russell	
Mike Grice	James Sanborn	
Brent Gukbudak	Santa Monica Mountains Trails	
Elayne Haggan	Council	
Terry Harman	Mike Schneider	
Jim Hasenauer	Mark Sedlacek	
Eileen Haworth	Philip Silverman	
Peter Heurnann	Esther Smith	
Kathy Hutchinson	James Smith	
Ray Jensen	Marvin Smith	
Gerald Katell	Milly St Charles	
Joan Kay	Shirley Stratton	
Hans Keifer	Jay Sullivan	

General Comments Received

There were several general comments about the overall SMMART project, the method of public involvement used, and implementation steps. They were not formally addressed by the project. Additional general comments about the SMMART process can be found among comments directed to specific Action Team reports as well. General comments included:

This summary mentions Los Angeles County, however, there is no indication that Ventura County participated.

I commend everyone who worked on the Draft report. It is concise, rational yet comprehensive enough to be a blueprint for actions. Abundant appreciation from a 25 year local resident and trail user by foot.

The format of the open house was not public at all nor was it an open house. I understand the various teams must have worked hard on their research and their representative speakers seemed sincere - however, a lot of what they said did not register. And some were not very good speakers to give information. The event was really frustrating. Dividing audience responses into separate groups did not permit the general audience to participate or get any real information. I'm sure many of the audience were also informed about the Santa Monica Mountains trails or they wouldn't have attended. As a participant, I think we should have heard their varied views. Your format discouraged getting any information. It seemed the goal of the NPS was to discourage input and debate, almost to the point of censorship; and it was contrary to your stated purpose. Also, your choice of Franklin Canyon location seemed intent on discouraging attendance. It is not an easy place to find in daylight and much worse in the dark via unlit rough roads. It was a terrible location in a city with so much more accessible sites.

We must have an ecological and cultural evaluation of the impact of trails on habitat and wildlands. It is my conclusion that the report did not get wide circulation, because it was not at my local library, and it was not on the Internet as advertised. Over time I have developed a bad attitude about the park services, and the referenced two year "sand box" study enhances my perspective of bureaucrats that can neither produce a consensus about the need for a park service trail crew, nor take responsibility for maintenance and security of proposed trail camps. My impression of the management agencies is that they are good at a) zealously maintaining public/park land against urban encroachment and b) aggressively pursuing the acquisition of new public lands. On the negative side there is bloated bureaucracy which is not in the field and they do not maintain or patrol the existing lands. When I encounter trail maintenance crews they are usually user groups, not park service personnel. Moreover, garbage cans at trailheads can overflow for week before being emptied. Park service staff need less in-office functions and more in-the-park functions. Ticket windows need to be staffed less, where spot checking of self-pay stickers in autos/campers will suffice.

I found the discussion format of the SMMART meeting to be very unsatisfactory. There was no way for community expression and sharing of ideas.

Three other general comments were received that addressed some of the initially identified priority issues that were not addressed by Action Teams. The appendix includes more information about these topic areas. These comments included:

Regarding Agencies Commitment to Cooperate: COSCA and Pt. Mugu State Park show that multi-use is an appropriate and viable policy for land managers. COSCA in particular has its act together. COSCA is an example of an agency that supports multi-use, makes good use of volunteer patrols and trail builders, supports public user education such as trail days or programs that educate elementary school children on park use and trail safety. COSCA has built a handicapped accessible trail while others just talk about it. This suggests to us that the goal to create "Santa Monica Mountains perceived as one park with unified rules and regulations" may be misguided. A more "market-driven" approach where land managers cooperate with each other but also are responsible for devising and monitoring their own policies will foster creative solutions and provide for a better experience for users than establishing one bureaucratic monolith of regulation.

Regarding Historic Trails: The section identifying issues that remain to be explored is a critical part of this document and provides specific direction for next steps in this process. In particular, review of historic trail uses may help support the effort to protect missing trail links and deserves priority attention.

Regarding Volunteers: It is a shame that volunteers got so little attention and deference and a report section could not be produced. It is my belief that most volunteers perform most of the trail maintenance. The lack of a report section on a trail crew keeps the lack of trail maintenance by park services from being exposed. Overgrowth along trails requires hikers to put their feet down where they can't see; a bad practice in an area with rattlesnakes. It also increases the transfer rate of ticks to hikers, a situation that will be of even greater concern now that Lyme disease is confirmed in the Santa Monica Mountains. The chances of touching poison oak are also increased. These issues are of even more concern for the occasional unsuspecting park

visitor.

Comments Received on the Trails Inventory Team Report

The final report has been revised to include a sample map from the trails inventory database, as well as some sample statistics produced by the trails inventory. The report goes into more detail on how the inventory can be used in the future as a planning tool, including for analyzing steepness information. The report also covers in more detail next steps that will be taken to complete the inventory, including mapping of dedicated trails on private lands as well as trails within the Conejo Open Space and Conservation Agency and Rancho Simi Park and Recreation District lands as they become available for public use, eventually including some of the private developments such as Dos Vientos and Wood Ranch trail systems. The report also provides updates on the production of a Recreation Area-wide map for public sale and distribution. Including historic trails that have not yet been dedicated for public use was deemed to be beyond the scope of the inventory. Comments included:

We look forward to seeing the final inventory and associated maps.

We recognize that this has taken a tremendous effort, and hope that the results will be made available to trail users in the form of better maps.

I support the recommendations.

Dedicated and historical trails should be included in this inventory. Those trails that are in cities and counties are just as important to note as those on state and federal lands. The trails that are on private land but are dedicated should be included in the inventory. In addition, the grade information would be a useful feature for noting the level of difficulty when recommending trails, as an example, for people new to the mountains or with young children.

This will provide a fantastic resource from which to develop a cohesive and effective policy once it is finalized.

I look forward to one regional map that includes all trails and maybe section maps that reveal local trails in great detail.

Where's the beef? What are the existing trails and specific details referred to? There is not even an example. The report will be in final form without review of the details. The trail maps should show an accurate representation of existing paved and dirt roads in the Santa Monica Mountains, so viewers can easily orient themselves.

Excellent goal, very much needed. Please add/include steepness/dificulty to hike/ride.

I appreciate the effort expended by this committee and do think that more structure is required as more people use our mountain trails.

Good work.

Comments Received on the Missing Links Team Report

A number of comments were provided suggesting additional missing links for inclusion in the report. Several of these were included in the list and the map if the route could be identified and if it was within the scope of the report. To clarify the relationship of that this effort was designed to supplement, not supplant, the work of other existing trail planning efforts such as by Los Angeles County and the Conejo Open Space and Conservation Agency, the title on the map was changed to "Additional Missing Links" and additional maps from already existing plans were added to the report. Changes were made to some of the descriptions of the missing links to clarify locations or reasons for connecting the link.

One comment requested additional detail be provided on the map, however, the difficulty in reducing the map to the 11 x 17 inch black and white format for this precludes the addition of too much information.

Larger scale color maps can be made available to implementing agencies with this additional location information. Some of the mapping of additional trails that are under development are under the purview of the Trails Inventory Team and were referred to them.

Several comments referred to the linkage needs of mountain bicyclists. Links suggested by mountain bicycling organizations that crossed private lands and needed acquisition or master plan amendment have already been or are now included as a missing link. Links suggested for mountain bicycle use on lands already in public ownership (thus not needing right-of-way acquisition, for example) were included in a new section called “Referred to Agencies for Consideration without Recommendation” in order to provide agencies with submitted information that was otherwise beyond the scope of the report. Also, included in this section were comments for needed “trail easements” on existing public lands and the need to include CalTrans in review of potential crossings of state highways.

The team did not identify priorities for addressing these missing links. It is hoped that priority setting will be addressed by the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area’s Land Protection Planning process and by the involved jurisdictions.

Comments included:

On one of my typical rides, I have ventured up Sullivan Canyon, along Mulholland and fire road 30 to the Hub, past Eagle Rock and Trippet Ranch, up Old Topanga Road, through Red Rock Canyon to Malibu Creek, up Bulldog and down Puerco Canyon and back along the Pacific Coast Highway. Quite a few stretches are on paved roads. A better trail system connecting these areas is probably more important for cyclists because of their much longer range.

I note that this team has identified a large number of significant missing links. Obviously, not all of these links can be added at once. In considering the priority links, I ask the team to consider that cyclists may have a greater need for filling missing links than other users. Cyclists can typically travel much further than other users, and in many cases can ride all of the trails in a section of the mountains during one trip. Strategically filling in missing links between different sections would greatly expand the opportunities for riding in the mountains.

Agreed - we need to have a trail link between Stunt Road and Malibu Creek and between Circle X and Point Mugu for example.

This team gave no note of the greater degree of discontinuity of trails for bicycles than for other users. An off-road link from Tapia Park to Malibu Creek would avoid a dangerous bike ride on the heavily traveled Malibu Canyon/Las Virgenes road. Another dream link is one from Valley Circle and Victory or Vanowen streets in West Hills to Cheesboro/Palo Comado.

Please provide plans for any future proposals to traverse State highways 101, 27, 405, and 23 rights-of-way so they can be given encroachment reviews. Thank you for including Cal Trans in the environmental review of the project.

The report of this team offers great potential for a connected trail system in the Santa Monica Mountains. Acquiring trail rights and connecting existing trails will provide more opportunities for visitors while better dispersing trail use. It is important to recognize that cyclists have fewer trail opportunities than other users. Current trail use policies cut off park areas for cyclists in the exact same way that a missing trail cuts off areas for any user. Since trail cyclists are far-ranging, this presents significant congestion problems as well as lost opportunities to a responsible user group. We submitted a list of our missing link priorities to the team. They turned it over to the Trail System Team where it got lost in the shuffle. We were dismayed that this list was not incorporated into the draft report. It should be included in the final SMMART document. [This list was attached and included the following trails: La Jolla Loop, Ray Miller Trail and Hidden Pond Trail in Point Mugu State Park; connector between Rancho Sierra Vista and Circle X Ranch outside of the wilderness boundary; connector between Leo Carillo Beach Campground to Malibu Springs to Circle X and the Backbone Trail; connector between Leo Carillo and Point Mugu State Park; Leo Carillo to Zuma/Trancas to Malibu City via Coastal Slope Trail; connector from Bonsall to Zuma Canyon within Zuma/Trancas; Yearling Trail to Lookout Trail, Tapia Spur Trail, Creek Trail from coast within Malibu Creek State Park; Rustic Canyon Trail to Rustic Canyon, Upper Bent Arrow from Mulholland, Santa Ynez Trail, Los Liones, Temescal Canyon to Trailer Canyon fire road, Topanga State Park to Stunt Road within Topanga State Park; All trails at Franklin Canyon; and Backbone Trail connectors between Stunt Road and Piuma and Hondo Canyon.]

I was pleased to see the completeness with which trail issues were identified in this report and alternative methods for addressing these issues. The report should become a valuable resource in the on-going development and management of a

regional trail system in the Santa Monica Mountains and the nearby areas. With regard to specific comments, below are a few comments and changes you may want to consider in your final report: 1) p. 23 The Lake Eleanor trail: this trail link has already been identified as a future trail within the Lake Eleanor Open Space to provide a trail connection to the Santa Monica Mountains Backbone Trail/Ladyface Trail. Please see the Parks, Trails and Open Space and Facilities map produced by the Conejo Recreation and Park District. 2) p. 26 the Anza Trail: the location shown on the Missing Links map does not reflect the proposed routes shown in the Juan Bautista de Anza Draft map Supplement (9/24, Sheet 25) or the route described in the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail Comprehensive Management and Use Plan, which would be located on a portion of COSCA's trail system (4/96, p. c-27). 3)

In reviewing the map for missing link trails as of the 8th of June meeting, I could not find the Chateau Calabasas Trail. This is a trail connecting the Calabasas Highlands to Calabasas Peak Mtn. Chateau Calabasas Trail is an approved future trail already graded through property south of Calabasas Highlands connecting Elsie Drive to Calabasas Peak Mtn. This trail has already been approved by LA County Planning and the LA Board of Supervisors as a condition to building any project on the Chateau Calabasas property. Please put this trail on your map and ask LA County to put it on their map. Ref: Thomas guide p. 589 E 1 & 2. This is a multi use trail running along a graded dirt road.

I support the recommendations.

Off Encinal Canyon Road there old Zuma Canyon Road starting and ending next to the water treatment plant - a several mile route accessing streams and waterfalls. In Northern Zuma Canyon trail needs to be rebuilt.

This team should send their recommended trail segments for connections to the various cities, agencies, and jurisdictions involved so they can begin the review, acquisition, construction, or trail plan amendments needed to help complete our trail system.

The Missing Links report did an excellent job of identifying areas where trail segments are needed in order to make connections between existing trails. We do feel that it is especially important for the bikers to have certain segments connected since their range is usually broader than the other groups.

As of this writing, the owner's are attempting to close off Jane's Trail.

With virtually hundreds of "backyard" and privately created trails this is a difficult but important task. In order to have a continuous trail system it is necessary to include as complete a list as possible. This would take exhaustive research and best be accomplished by having team members interact with trail users from the numerous communities along the entire Santa Monica Mountains NRA. I am certain that there are even more missing links than have been deemed significant by this team.

With all the input, dedication and diplomacy from the mountain bike community, obvious omissions still occurred, such as not including the list of trail links submitted by CORBA.

Need links for Old Agoura to Jordan Ranch, Simi Peak, under freeway from Chumash Park.

It would be beneficial to understand the impact of the completed links as to issues of limited access, imminent threats of closures, current and project usage rates. Links list: the following items do not include a statement of the problem: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 25, 26, 27, 29, 33. We are in complete support of the intent of the links identified in, or impacting, the Malibu Park areas of Malibu, including, but not limited to: #17, 15, 16, 24, and 32 [Point Dume Trail, Fernhill Trail, Clover Heights Trail, Malibu Equestrian Center Trail, and Coastal Slope Trail]. We are also in support of the other links identified in Malibu as a whole. We understand that further study is required and issues may surface before the trails are implemented.

Thank you for your beautiful maps. Purchase Rustic/Sullivan now. We need to extend Backbone Trail to include Dirt Mulholland, Mulholland (paved) at Topanga Canyon Blvd. Mulholland to Summit and Summit. Trails may need to be closed.

Agreed - we need to have a trail link between Stunt Road and Malibu Creek and between Stunt Road and Point Mugu.

We are pleased that the SMMART Draft Report describes and recommends quite a number of additional trails not yet adopted by local jurisdictions. We know that as the area develops, the need for trails will increase. There is some confusion regarding the Missing Links map, however, because the map shows some of the Los Angeles county proposed trails, but not others. For example Stokes Ridge Trail east of Mulholland is shown, while Stokes Ridge Trail west is not, which could be interpreted as meaning either the eastern segment is more important or that the western segment is already in public ownership so we don't have to worry about it (only 1 mile of the western segment is dedicated to the County and about 2 1/2 miles is still private. This is a critical missing link). In fact the County's map is mostly missing links at this time. Although Los Angeles County's Master Plan for trails is referenced on p. 21, the master plan map is not shown. We believe the master plan of trails should be included on a separate page within the report. It would be appropriate to also include a copy of Conejo Recreation and Park District's trail plan for that area. The Santa Monica Mountains Trails Council assisted the county's efforts to adopt the master

plan and has continued to assist and advise the county, the coastal commission and the several new cities that have incorporated since 1981 regarding trails on the plan. Many separate pieces of trail have been dedicated through the master plan, but most of these trails are still incomplete, needing additional right-of-way dedications. We wouldn't want future planners and legislators to assume that the SMMART missing links map represent the only or the most essential missing links in the Santa Monica Mountains area. We suggest you might call your map "additional missing trail links." Following are four more missing links to add to your map: 1) extend Westlake connector trail through the city of Westlake along Lindero Creek to Lakeview Canyon Road. 2) Add Chateau Calabasas connector from Mulholland Highway to Calabasas Motorway 3) Add Los Angeles River/Anza connector from the new Valley Circle Interchange bridge of the 101 freeway. 4) Include Hidden Hills connector at Valley Circle interchange bridge.

As development increases in the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, historically used trails on private property are increasingly disappearing. We strongly encourage swift action in obtaining identified right-of-way acquisitions and master plan amendments as indicated by the Team.

Missing links map does not show Latigo Canyon Road. Maps need to show roads so that viewers can easily orient themselves. Priorities need to be identified among this large list of trails. The Backbone Trail link should be separated from the offshoots that in aggregate are referred to as the Backbone loop. The Backbone link should have the highest priority since it has provided a major theme for the Santa Monica Mountains NRA. A trail from Agoura Hills to the crest of Ladyface mountain then along the crest to Westlake Village should be included, possibly even linking to the reservoir area south of Westlake.

A trail system stretching the length of the Santa Monica Mountains is a most worthwhile goal. How fortunate we Angelinos are to have these mountains so close to home.

The Conservancy owns most of the land on both sides of Chesebro Road between the Agoura Hills city limit and Cheseboro NRA. There needs to be permanent trail easements dedicated on both sides of Chesebro road to insure continued access should the Conservancy ever sell any of this property. Potomac Sports Properties Owns a short section over which trail easements need to be extended. Many equestrians, hikers, and pedestrians now use narrow, twisty Chesebro road and this creates an extremely dangerous situation. An existing informal trail on the west side of Cheseboro Road needs legal easement protection. Old Agoura Park is an official staging area for Cheseboro NRA. There is a dedicated and constructed trail in the City of Agoura Hills from Old Agoura park headed toward Cheseboro NRA to the city limit.

We would like to point your attention to a number of trails which do not appear on your maps for the Santa Monica Mountains. Our organization represents residents and homeowners from the Triunfo and Lobo Canyon areas of western Los Angeles. It includes hikers, equestrians and bicyclists so we are interested in all of these categories of recreation and transportation. Route 1 (Sherwood Forest connecting Westlake Village and Agoura) is vital to increase the use of bicycles as a transportation element in our area because it provides a low elevation gain means of transportation between Westlake Village and Agoura area. We would appreciate notification of the eventual status of these trails.

Trail from Los Liones at Sunset Boulevard to the beach (1/4 mile). This would make a connection from Topanga State Park to Beach protected sidewalk on Sunset.

Since the point of linking existing trails is to provide more continuous mileage of trails, I would strongly advise making any links between trails open to bikes be likewise open to biking. It would only make sense since bicycles can cover more continuous miles than just any other users with the possible exception of equestrians.

We are a local consultant working with home builders, developers, and open space agencies, including the National Park Service, to plan, design and survey the construction of several new trails in and adjacent to the Santa Monica Mountains. It is not clear from reading the report if the scope of work for the various teams was intended to focus on the Backbone Trail or if regional connections were to be a consideration. Many miles of new multipurpose trails that should ultimately connect to the Santa Monica Mountains trails are currently under construction or in design. Examples include portions of the Dos Vientos Ranch trail system connecting Rancho Sierra Vista in Thousand Oaks to Camarillo and the Wood Ranch trails system in Simi Valley, potentially connecting the COSCA system to China Flat. Both of these examples may ultimately be part of the De Anza trail, also. There trails are not shown in the Missing Links discussion. We suggest the referenced regional trail map include mapping of the adjacent regional trail systems, both existing and proposed. These trails systems should include both the Ventura County systems and the trails in the San Fernando and western San Gabriel Valleys. Consistent referencing of these interconnections will serve to remind the public about how the entire system can function.

Comments Received on the Trail Camps Report

The team considered, but rejected, comments questioning the need for a trail camp network within the Santa Monica Mountains. There is a documentable demand for such camps among users. Such camps are also part of the original concept for the Backbone Trail. Some existing camps may not be well used because agencies have provided little information about their availability, others are well-used. The final report was modified to include a twelfth trail camp at Will Roger's State Historical Park which could be located outside the historic zone so as not to impact the historic resource values of the park. This report concentrated on trail camps along the Backbone Trail, therefore adding camps like the one suggested at La Jolla was beyond the scope of the team. The team considered and recommended operational guidelines they believe mitigate potential impacts of horse use at camp sites. Agencies will have to conduct environmental analyses prior to the development of any new camps. These analyses could review the potential impacts and recommend additional mitigation measures at that time, if needed. Operational guideline #2 addresses the potential for a future reservation system, if demand proved such a system to be necessary. Operational guideline #5 was modified to drop the words "vehicle access". In some cases, vehicle access to provide for maintenance, water tanks, and other facilities might be welcomed.

Several comments addressed the use of the camps by mountain bicycles and other users. Equestrian use is mentioned because it is perceived to need some additional facilities. Usage of the trail camps would be determined by the allowed use of trails accessing the trail camp site. For example, if the trail leading to the camp is open to cyclists, the trail camp would be also.

Comments included:

In the presentations, trails camps were for all users. Item 5 of the operations guidelines on page 33 states "no vehicle access". As bicycles are sometimes considered vehicles, this statement should be changed to "no motorized vehicles".

I am also interested in the Trail Camp issue which we are hoping will be accepted so that [Trips for Kids] will be able to take kids on overnight bike rides.

Agreed - multiple use.

This team sidestepped the issue of camping for trail cyclists. Some of the trail camp sites identified are next to section of the Backbone trail which are still closed to bikes. It is our view that the Backbone Trail must be open to bikes (with a bikes OK alternate route around the Boney wilderness) and that trail camps outside the wilderness should accommodate bikes.

We are not sure if we agree that trail camps are appropriate in the Santa Monica Mountains, due to the potential problems associated with overnight use. There is no indication that if established, trail camps will be accessible to cyclists.

Has the National Park Service or State Department of Parks and Recreation responded formally to the proposal for trail camps within their jurisdictions?

I support the recommendations. However, under Operational Guidelines, item number 5 should read "...no motor vehicle access."

Addition of a trail camp site at Will Rogers State Park is necessary. Long term parking areas at the eastern and western trailheads of the Backbone Trail should be considered. The team should present the final recommendations to each of the jurisdictions involved to encourage the review, construction and completion of the sites within a reasonable period of time.

This team's report ignored the needs of mountain bicyclists that wish to have a camping experience while traveling through the Santa Monica Mountains NRA. It appears that the focus of this group is on equestrian facilities. Facilities for all users should be considered and provided for. Mountain bicyclists are in agreement that the wilderness areas are closed, however, there are alternative routes available that can accommodate bicycles.

The camp plan is wonderful. May it come to pass.

No trail camps and no signage unless in an existing state park or at Zuma. This is not Griffith Park or Central Park. No trail camp at Stunt. Trail camp at Corbin/Steer and at Slauson none Stunt Ranch. Need a greater evaluation of the camps (trail camps with horses are a disaster if not controlled).

A trail camp at the eastern end of Backbone Trail is necessary to maximize public access and the recreational potential of the trail. Visitors will travel long distances to use backpack the Backbone Trail and they won't all arrive in the morning. Some people will come with horses and therefore not be able to stay overnight in a motel. There is no horse camping available in the area. Long term parking is needed at both ends of the Backbone Trail and at several sites along the trail.

Although the idea of extended backcountry trips is tempting, the reality is that the overwhelming majority of trail users are day only. The potential environmental degradation associated with installing more backcountry camps needs to be carefully weighed. The lesser impacts related to creating a small tent area make that a preferable idea to additional equestrian camps with the associated problems of excessive soil compaction, loss of surface vegetation, importation of invasive exotics in horse feed and manure, and problems associated with the removal of manure. In order to protect the backcountry area from further impacts related to direct (droppings on trails, seed dispersal, increased pests) and indirect (additional nutrient flows in stormwater runoff) aspects of horse management, any trail camps for equestrians should be accessible for either packing out manure, composting on site (as per specifications in the Resource Conservation District's Santa Monica Mountains Stable and Horse Management Manual for the Malibu Creek Watershed) or direct removal with vehicles as is required at the Malibu Equestrian Center. Therefore we do not support the recommendation I-8 (p. 84) to categorically provide trail camps every six miles along the Backbone Trail.

It is not clear why we need, or should have, a camp site network. Current sites are underutilized, closed, and/or not maintained. One or two existing campsites could be maintained and used for a trial period and usage evaluated before committing to an expanded network. The management agencies should be responsible for maintaining and checking security of campsites - don't put the responsibility off to volunteers. Campsites within one mile of roads may be more subject to vandalism and crime than more interior camps. The La Jolla Valley campsite is not identified.

All backcountry camping should be on a reservation system. Volunteers could check camps to make sure visitors (campers) have permits to camp there. Horse people should have separate areas for horses and their own camping.

Trail camps should be on a reservation system and camps should be monitored by volunteers or park personnel.

What a great idea to open our mountains to backpackers as well as day hikers. I hope we can achieve this.

Comments Received on the Signage Team Report

The signage inventory was not intended to be a complete inventory of signs, hence the recommendation that one be undertaken by the agencies. The inventory shown here focused primarily on regulatory, directional, and service signage. The team considered comments that the inventory should include examples of trail courtesy or etiquette signs. The team felt that trail courtesy signs are a function of interpretation and was perceived to be beyond the scope of the team. The team felt that such information about use of the trails and other interpretation information should be provided at a trailhead or kiosk area. One concern is that trail courtesy signage has the potential to contribute to sign pollution. The signage inventory has been modified to remove some of the confusing text associated with the icons.

The team considered the need for signage for difficulty and steepness. They felt such information is subjective and they questioned the feasibility of such signage given topographical changes along the trail. They also felt that users should be willing to accept a little bit of adventure in negotiating the trail system.

The team agrees signs should be posted after rains about avoiding use. Currently park rangers are supposed to post such signs after significant rains, but this may not be occurring consistently. Comments included:

Draft report omitted designs for 1) multi-use yield signs, 2) courtesy signs ("rules of the road") to help educate users at trailheads, and 3) signs suggesting avoid use during rainy periods (mother nature causes the most problems!)

We were surprised that some of the user education, multiple use etiquette signs weren't included in the inventory. They are already in use in State Parks, COSCA, and Conservancy units.

The inventory omitted "multi-use" signs such as are used by COSCA and California State Parks Department. The inventory omitted user education signs to be placed at multi-use trail heads. These signs can be an important aid in user education. We also feel that signs specifically warning users to avoid trails during periods following heavy rain can help prevent damage. Also advisory "Not recommended for _____" signage.

Was there any discussion by the team regarding signage for the degree of trail difficulty, and if so, what was the conclusion of the team?

I support the recommendations.

[Supports improved signage at trail entry points and trail junctions to clearly indicate allowed uses and mileage.] Would add caution signs where appropriate, e.g., road crossings (dirt and paved) and on seriously blind spots on the trail. At serious blind spots, signs could say trail users should announce their presence.

This team's suggestion of standardization and consistency among all of the agencies will need considerable review and coordination by them. Further complicating the process will be the financial factor for the agencies to utilize the supplies on hand or to order enough until a standard is agreed upon by them all.

Unfortunately, the signage team seemed to focus only on signs that were regulation oriented. Nothing was mentioned about the educational opportunities at trailheads. This is the location that sets the tone for the entire park experience. If park users see multiple use signs at the beginning of their outing then they will know what to expect as they travel through the park.

With all the input, dedication and diplomacy from the mountain bike community, obvious omissions still occurred, such as not including the multi-use triangle in the signage section.

Uniformity should be a priority. National Park signs, white figure on black background is best. Strike out mark indicating "no" easiest to understand.

Inventory of signage: icons are confusing. They appear to suggest permitted uses but caption references non-permitted activities.

It is very important that signage thoroughly identify trail heads and junctions and that there is agreement with maps. I have personally suffered a life-threatening night on the trail in a dehydrated and hypothermic state due to disagreement between signage and the Tom Harrison map, the map of common usage. Lives may depend on accurate, complete signage.

We concur with the recommendations of this team.

Is "signage" a code word for we want less bikes? Signage is not a big issue. We simply need more useful signs at interior regions (e.g., at forks) to inform people of directions and distance. The suggested evaluation of signage sounds like a bureaucratic sandbox.

Please include steepness/difficulty.

Instructional signs should be at trailheads regardless of where park boundaries are.

With more and more people using our mountains and many who are new to hiking, having information for them to acquaint themselves with joys, do's and don't's would be most helpful.

Good work.

Comments Received Multiple Use Trail Guidelines Team Report

In April, 1996, the Multiple Use Trail Guidelines Team circulated a draft report for review by SMMART participants. Comments on the original draft were received up through August of last year. Most of the comments addressed the original introduction (now context section) describing how the team arrived at its

recommendations. SMMART participants questioned the inclusion of the victory statement (which was the original “vision” created by each Action Team when it began its work) and some of the history and information related to the Santa Monica Mountains. This information was largely removed from the second draft report. Source information was added to provide more basis for the recommendations. Recommended guidelines are essentially unchanged in the April, 1996 and February, 1997 drafts and in this final report. The context section has been clarified.

A number of comments were received on the February, 1997 draft questioning the make up of the team that produced the report. Clarification of the participation by various trail user representatives was included in the report. Checking the attendance records at the meetings leading up to the agreements on the recommended guidelines indicated that there was equal participation of mountain bicyclists and hikers and equestrians during this period which continued through to today, although some participants have dropped off the team. Team members felt that both sides of the issue had listened well to each other and the report clearly spells out where the team reached agreement and where it did not.

A number of comments seemed closely related to the issue of trail use access and were more in the purview of the Trail System Team and were not addressed by this team. The suggestion that this team and the Trails Inventory Team work together to identify trails that are appropriate for multiple and single use only was deemed beyond the scope of the team.

There were a number of comments suggesting the team should have addressed the issue of applying the recommended guidelines to existing trails. The team felt that their purpose had been initially established to address only the question of how to build a new trail that could safely and enjoyably accommodate multiple users. The team agrees that the decision about how to apply the guidelines to existing trails is the purview of the implementing agencies, but did not agree on guidance to give the agencies on this issue, other than to point to the example of the Mid Peninsula Open Space Agency’s process for applying their trail guidelines to existing trails.

The team considered comments relating to aspects of the recommended guidelines. Comments relating to the team report on line of sight and assumptions about speed of trail users moving downhill were clarified. The team agreed with comments that backing horses up into turnouts would be impractical, but felt that the turnouts could be used by others when they see another user approaching. Comments about sound are considered an etiquette issue and not related to trail construction. Rolling grade dips are becoming widely accepted by many land managing agencies, are easier to maintain than water bars, and don’t introduce something unnatural into the environment. Steps can be dangerous for users to negotiate and expensive to build and maintain. Comments about shoulder width and drop off are addressed as part of the team’s recommended sideslopes and grades. Comments about additional brushing information were not added because the team felt that agencies should follow already existing brushing standards on removing roots and other obstacles within the trail tread and otherwise leaving them in place off the tread. The team considered and felt that properly built and maintained trails will reduce the erosional impact of all users. The report adjusted the references to show which sources supported which recommended trail widths. The team accepts that a wider bench will be cut and that vegetation will grow back, leaving a narrower tread between maintenance cycles. The team felt that guidelines for staffing and enforcement suggested were beyond the scope of the team.

Comments included:

This group, along with the Links group, produced the most useful reports. Good job!

As a member of this team, I believe our report was weakened by the removal of our discussions of issues that led us to the guidelines. I felt the discussions provided the readers with insight to apply the guidelines. [The team leader] removed our discussions as a result of some comments from the SMMART participants that our discussions were our opinions and not fact. If the TST statements remain, the Multiple Use Trail Guidelines Team should have the same opportunity.

I endorse the proposed trail standards for new trail construction. Good trail design makes sharing and maintaining trails better for all. Existing trails which may not meet those standards can still be shared by pedestrians, equestrians, and cyclists.

We believe that good trail alignment, construction and maintenance is fundamental to a working trail system. This team developed well researched standards for new trail construction. We are two important comments. 1) it was generally agreed by the team that when a trail was built to the proposed new 48-60" tread, it would be acceptable that the vegetation might grow back to an approx. 36" tread. This was not stated in the report and should be. All trail users want the close-in, natural experience that narrow trails provide. 2) it is important to reiterate our view that existing trails and even new trails that don't meet the proposed guidelines might still be very acceptable for shared use. These should be taken as ideal standards not minimum standards.

This strikes us as potentially the most useful part of the SMMART report. The Pt Mugu State Park has done an excellent job in designing and building multi-use trails and we are glad that the team visited the new Guadalupe Trail and made use of the State Park Rangers' expertise.

p. 53, figure 1: These trail details should be enlarged where necessary to make it easier to read the dimensions and notes. The details overall are excellent.

Table 2: please add to design feature on clearing (vegetation) clearing on up side of trail should have all roots removed. Clearing on downside of trail must not have roots of vegetation removed so stability of slope can be maintained.

I support the recommendations.

The draft statement, bottom line p. 49 wrongly states that hiking members support the multi use guidelines for "new trails". From the start, we hikers argued that not all new trail construction should be built to multiple use standards. These wide trails are simply inappropriate for certain terrain that could support narrow trails appropriate for hikers and equestrians would be much cheaper to build and cheaper to maintain. What percentage of new trail construction should be built to multi use standards remains an open, unaddressed issue that should not be ignored. There are also drawbacks to a common trail system that doesn't provide for the security and aesthetic needs of hikers and equestrians who are disturbed and intimidated by speeding bicycles.

On our guidelines for multiple use trails there was not a team consensus on all issues. As the only equestrian on the team, I have expressed strong feelings about several factors - safety, enjoyment and relaxation, and protection of resources. Safety - Multiple use trails should be at least 60" minimum tread width. Most bicycles do not slow down as the trail gets steeper. A major problem for other trail users is that they cannot hear the bicycle behind them or in front of them. A large percentage of bicycle riders do not follow the CORBA [Concerned Of-Road Bicyclists Association] recommendations regarding right of way as shown on the sign they designed indicating bicycles yielding to horses and hikers. Enjoyment - Hundreds of hikers and equestrians no longer use many trails because the mountain bikes have taken them over by their sheer numbers. It is not relaxing nor enjoyable to be constantly alert for the possibility of having to quickly move out of the way of a speeding bicycle, even if the biker doesn't appear. Protection of resources - when trails are damp, horses' hooves make depressions in the dirt, but it is not a continual depression, and it will be filled in with more use. Bicycles tires make a continuous track depression which contributes to and encourages erosion. The team's goal was to develop guidelines for new trails, but these same guidelines must be applied to existing trails as well, if they are to be multiple use trails. If a trail does not meet these guidelines, including the 60 inch tread width, then those trails should not be multiple use until they are brought up to the standards. The issues of conflict between the trail users cannot be resolved until the leadership of CORBA and IMBA (International Mountain Bicycling Association) are truly willing to compromise regarding the most serious differences, and remove their underlying agenda of wanting to be on all trails that are open to horses.

SMMART was to be for trails coordination, all trails, not just new ones. This team only came up with guidelines for new trails and in addition ignored several important design features. Some of the guidelines are unsafe and do not promote the enjoyment for all users. Steeper grades should have a rougher tread to encourage bicyclists to slow down, and should have steps to help reduce erosion. Tread should be over 5 feet wide on all multiple use trails. Line of sight: more distance should be allowed on steeper grades and blind curves. Assumption that cyclist goes slower downhill is dramatically flawed. Bicyclists move faster downhill for the challenge, risk, the thrill as well as the laws of physics. Turnouts: this feature may not be feasible for a horse to back into but it could be used by hikers and cyclists. Rolling grade dip: this design encourages bicyclists using this for a jump. Several features not addressed are steps, water bars and sound. Steps provide a high degree of trail preserva-

tion and variety and reduce maintenance. Water bars provide a stable, long term trail design. Sound: the silent cyclist surprises the unsuspecting horse or hiker should be tempered with a human voice calling out 'bicycle' and with slowing considerably while on trails that other users use. The team representation was not balanced regarding trail user interests. There were 2 agency people that were very pro-mountain bike along with 3 mountain bikers, so that makes 5 people favoring bikes. Three hikers quit early and were not contributing participants to the report. That left 1 hiker and 1 equestrian with 5 mountain bikers, an obvious unbalanced representation. Under recommendations, the team commented on other wheeled machines. In part because there was not any 'known extensive use' nor adequate information, they did not include their uses in the guidelines. It is unfortunate and short-sighted that they did not recommend against the use of skateboards, slalom boards, and skating as recreational uses that seriously and negatively would impact resources.

This report represents an excellent compendium of how a new trail should be constructed. They did an excellent job of taking information and resources available from a variety of sources to create a guideline for how future trails should be constructed. What about existing trails that are not constructed to these specifications? Certainly there are many trails that do not meet these guidelines that are currently open and being used by bicyclists without a problem. I hope it is made clear that these guidelines are to be used for the construction of new trails only and not applied to existing trails for determining use.

Please save some trails for horses and hikers only.

The recommendations about the physical characteristics of the trail are reasonable and not inconsistent with other guidelines noted in the report. Depending on the mix of [users] they may be compatible or having problems. The total amount of traffic can contribute to the success of these guidelines. The easiest thing to do is identify and describe dimensions for the space needed and occupied by the various users. How all these dimensions are used by the users is the subject of greater concern. Conflicts on trail use are not because of a specific physical characteristic of the trail but the incompatibility of the activities of each of the user groups. In the Oak Creek Access Trail, physical separation by a pipefence is needed to separate out bikers from all other users. Even on the widest possible trails, i.e., Sycamore Canyon, it is not possible to separate users groups so that accidents occur. This raises the possibility that bikers and other users be separated in either time or space. There is precedent for separating user group in different recreational settings. We may have to rethink what we expect from our parks. The first obligation is protecting the resource. One part of the resource for any park is the absence of harassment and the opportunity to have quiet and solitude. The presence of machines to use the park as an obstacle course is not consistent with preserving the resource. Who is the park supposed to serve? The Guadalupe Trail the team observed was made with the new trail building machine. With increasing emphasis on cost containment, there will be more use of this trail machine. Eventually the only new trails will be those made by this machine. The multi-use physical characteristic will be imposed whether we like it or not. This was brought out in a discussion with the team. [A new trail made with the machine] was more cost-effective but not necessarily [was] the trail tailor made for the need. All discussions of trail use is academic unless someone on the local level can make a decision. The need is for the local authority to decide on a case by case basis, within a conceptual framework, how trails will be administered. Unless and until this authority is given to the local land manager and is taken by the land manager, nothing will get done. The different jurisdictions must come to some consensus because the properties form a seamless web and would create chaos if there were different rules.

The multiple use team should work with the inventory team to identify trails that are appropriate for multiple use and single use only? P. 55 Line of Sight: Assumption that cyclists move at slower speeds the steeper the downhill is flawed.

Agreed. Please keep all single track trails open. Shared use is possible. If everyone understands responsible trail use.

We understand this team addressed standards for new multiple use trails and made no suggestion for applying those standards to existing trails. With this in mind, we re-iterate our adopted position that personal safety of trail users is the overriding consideration when deciding whether a trail should be opened to multiple users. The primary question should be: can this trail be safely used by hikers, equestrians, and bicyclists at the same time? We know from experience that hikers and equestrians are compatible trail users and pose no safety problems. Thus, the real issue is whether bicyclists pose a safety hazard to hikers and equestrians. Our experience shows that in many cases bicyclists are a danger to others when trails exhibit certain physical characteristics: 1) trail width, shoulder and drop off: safety on narrow trails requires the user be able to move off the trail to avoid an emergency. This means being able to move quickly out of the way of a speeding bicyclist. On a narrow trail, the options are limited to the uphill slope or the downhill drop-off. We oppose multiple use designation for any narrow trail with a drop-off on the downhill side and a steep slope on the uphill side. 2) Trail grade: grade is directly related to downhill bicycle speed which appears to be the most common factor in bicycle incidents with hikers and equestrians. It is interesting to note that no one hears about any incidents that occur when bicyclists are riding uphill, but there have been innumerable problems and accidents caused by bicyclists who cannot stop in time. Steep trails are inherently more prone to bicycle accidents than flat trails and they require a better escape potential for the hiker and equestrian. We believe that trails with significant grade must have particularly good forward visibility and width factors before they can be considered for multiple use. 3) Forward visibility: this is another major factor. Many trails in the Simi Hills have blind curves or switchbacks, which severely limit the user's ability to see an oncoming cyclist and to gauge his rate of speed and degree of control. This limited forward visibility seriously reduces the reaction time hiker or riders need for moving out of the way. Unfortunately, frequent switchbacks often occur in conjunction with narrow trails along the side of a mountain with steep drop-offs. Such trails have

virtually no escape potential and should never be designated multiple use. 4) The startle factor: Rapidly approaching bicycles, appearing suddenly and unexpectedly alarm other trail users and ruin their pleasant experience. On narrow trails with little or no visibility, the risk of collision between bicyclists and other users dramatically rises. 5) Excessive downhill speed: multiple use proponents contend that the only reason to close trails to bicyclists is "environmental sensitivity". We do not agree. We believe trails should be closed to bicyclists when the trail's physical characteristics require closure for the safety of other user groups. At the heart of the conflict between hikers, equestrians, and bicyclists is the very real issue of excessive speed. This is what separates cyclists from other user groups. Hikers and equestrians are repeatedly forced to deal with speeding bicyclists throughout the NRA. Many are now afraid to use trails which they have enjoyed for many years. Mountain biking attracts a significant percentage of enthusiasts who are looking for thrills, speed and a sport where they can perform on the edge. These people are a danger to trail users. 6) Quality of the outdoor trail experience: Although safety of all users must be the primary consideration when establishing policies for multiple use, the NPS should also seek to enhance the many positive experiences provided by outdoor recreation. People use trails for many reasons: to exercise, to enjoy the beauty of the landscape, to pass time with friends, or to commune with nature. For most, walking or riding a horse is a quiet, slow, peaceful endeavor. Mountain bikers may share these values, but increasingly this sports emphasizes speed, audacity, risk-taking, and on the edge behavior. Because mountain biking requires the use of a vehicle - a machine - it is a fundamentally different experience from hiking and riding a horse. These fundamentally different experiences may be compatible and inoffensive to each other, but only where there is sufficient space and distance to allow each user to do his own thing without affecting the safety of others. As space and distance diminishes, the conflicts on trails intensify and compatibility vanishes. In this case, multi use designation should not be considered. By subjecting every potential multi use trail to these recommended standards we are confident that the final document issued by the SMMART process will be widely accepted by the community.

Mountain bikes have little area to use. Equestrian trails are closed to us. We do little damage do to our small numbers and light weight. I was born here (in 1942) and have hike/biked for 40 years. I rarely see more than 1/20 the number of bikers when compared to hikers. We (bikers) need to observe common rules of courtesy but should have access (equal) to all the trails - including equestrian trails - on a 24 hour basis.

I do not believe that there is any possible way to design a trail that will accommodate multiple types of users. As wide as a fire road is a bicycle passing as a group or even a single biker disturbs the hikers' state of being in the mountains. How can a trail be built that will take the wear and tear of many bikers. We already see erosion where only occasional bikes travel the narrow trails (illegally). The issue really is the compatibility of multiple types of users on a common trail not how to build a trail that will allow bicycles, equestrians and hikers and runners all on the same trail.

Some of the people listed as participants did not take part in the process to formulate the guidelines. Their names should be removed or noted which members did not participate in various stages of the team's work. It seems the only group that embraces these guidelines is the mountain bike interests. This point is validated by the [user statements in the TST report of the hiker, equestrian and runner] who do not favor mountain bike use on trails less than 8' wide. The guidelines should recommend minimum requirements for staffing for security and enforcement on all multiple use trails before any new multiple use trails are constructed or existing trails opened. We disagree with the purpose of the report. We believe that the guidelines will 1) create more unsafe trail conditions, 2) drive non-machine park users away from the trails and 3) have a negative impact on the delicate, disappearing ecosystems on our taxpayer owned and supported public land. Please document the extensive trail building experience of the two agency representatives on this team, including a list of trails (locations and descriptions) they have personally designed, built or directly supervised. Provide documentation of the academic qualifications and work experience of the two agency representatives to represent the interests of the physically challenged. Why wasn't there a legitimate representative of this interest on the team? We found the interests of a broad spectrum of challenged individuals was absent from the SMMART process. "As trails progress further away ..." We trails runners have found bikers become more bold as they leave populated areas. Agency types may not spend much time on the trails in the Santa Monica Mountains, but there aren't any uncrowded trails left. The ecosystem is being damaged for the benefit of people who feel that they have the right to spoil the environment and change non-machine users from the parks because they want the thrill of the single track experience. Everyone is welcome in the parks - vehicles are not welcomed on trails under 8' wide. [Re the Mid-Peninsula Open Space process]: we take strong exception to this point. Given the steep, erosion prone nature of trails in the Santa Monica Mountains, the idea is absurd on its face. We wonder why the NPS and CDPR [California Department of Parks and Recreation] feel so strongly about the advisability of giving over (often in violation of their own administrative regulations and the law) large chunks of a delicate, diminishing public ecosystem to further the economic interests of the mountain bike industry and thrill seekers. Please define "consensus" as it is used in the SMMART process. [Re skateboarders, slalom boards, skaters, and mountain wheel chairs:] displays of such equipment is common at sports expos. A trip to Mammoth Mountain in the summer would provide team members with a lot of information and a first hand experience if they need another thrill. We've been told that skate trail boards and slalom boards are a big problem already in the San Diego area. We believe the mountain bike interests are trying to distance themselves from other machine users because they realize the arguments they are using to justify entry of their machines on the trails could be used by all of the other machine users. The numbers of machines on the trails and the ensuing environmental damage would be a disaster. The guidelines are opening the doors of the parks to many, many machine users. Please be specific about the benefits of a common trail system. It would be interesting to include in the guidelines NPS' or CDPR's projected taxpayer costs to include machines on trails in the parks. A cost benefit analysis of sorts. Millions of taxpayer dollars to insure damage to shrinking ecosystems on public land for the

benefit of a multi-billion dollar industry that makes generous campaign contributions. [Re comment that proposed widths... do not vary greatly from existing systems":] please document as much "research" is tainted by the bias of the "researchers". Our extensive trail experience, like that of hikers and equestrians, has shown that bikes are a danger and menace to the environment and other park users on trails other than fire roads (even on fire roads bikes create serious hazards, accidents and death). None of the public entities charged to oversee park land has the staff or resources to even begin to patrol existing multi use trails (fire roads) much less single track trails. In effect, there is no policing of trails in the Santa Monica Mountains. After consideration we find the guidelines unacceptable: 1) multi use trails that include machine use must be at least 8' wide (tread) to provide safe clearance for all park users; 2) a trail must be 100% compatible with multi use guidelines before it is opened to multiple use that includes machine use; 3) thousands of acres of habitat will have to be sacrificed in order to meet the 8' requirement. We believe that machine users should keep their vehicles on existing fire roads and leave the rest of the mountains to the little ecosystem that taxpayers have left; 4) We find the qualifications of the "trail experts" on the team to be lacking in experience and education. More technical and expert involvement is needed to develop these guidelines (For example, the suggestion that all steps be eliminated from trails; impossible, a fact well known to experienced trails builder in the Santa Monica Mountains). The majority of the team represents either mountain bike users or the mountain bike industry. It would be useful for team members to disclose any income or other types of assistance they derive or receive from hiking, equestrian or mountain bike interests or businesses. The public may get the impression that these guidelines were created by regular "users" not people with a monetary interest in the outcome.

I find this draft report, as I commented on the drafts before it, unprofessional and grossly biased in its presentation of information. The many opportunities taken to color the intended subject matter distract from the document's intent. Consider: p. 50 #2: the sentence beginning "Agency representatives ..." discusses agency opinions in the equestrian/hiker context. This should be deleted unless this is the appropriate place to offer all opinions from all parties. P. 50 #3 The sentence beginning "The equestrian/hiking..." offers an equestrian/hiker opinion of the mountain bicyclist's context. This should be deleted. If you offer one argument, you must offer all arguments. P. 50, paragraph 4, "The consensus..." reference to the Mid-Peninsula Open Space Agency report should be deleted. You cite the team's consensus and then interject a subject that was not part of the consensus. This is not objective. Recommendations p. 50, paragraph 4, what is the difference between "policing" and "control". Paragraph 4: The purpose of this paragraph seems only to be the suggestion that a width of 60" is more than generous. If you can't use the 48" references, don't try to sway me with the "several" sources line. The 60" source is from one of your own members, the team chair and author of the document. Is this objective? Guidelines p. 51, Turnout-passing sections. If required, these trail guidelines aren't really for multi-use. Regardless, the turnouts will not be used and will destroy more resources. Rolling grade dip - these are great for bikes but erode easily and require regular maintenance. Wood bars are more durable. My own opinion on appropriate guidelines for multiple use trails is that mountain bikes should only be allowed on appropriate 8 foot wide roads.

I reject in the strongest possible terms the report of the Multiple Use Guidelines Team. The report is invalid because the committee was not composed of a balanced cross-section of user groups. The committee ended up with almost exclusive bicycle group representatives giving input. Thus the hiking and equestrian representative were heavily outnumbered, not to mention that there were no representatives from important groups including the physically challenged, the runners' groups and Native Americans. The two agency people on the team have long expressed a pro-bicycle basis, so they should not be considered to represent any other group, including the physically disabled. Even though there was much hard work and much valuable information in the report, the lack of consensus on substantive issues and the lack of equitable representation among key user groups really negates the credibility of the report. Guidelines for new trails proposed by a heavy pro-bike majority are not balanced, not realistic, and not representative. And it is noted that the team did not come to a consensus for guidelines on existing trails, a most critical issue in the Santa Monica Mountains NRA. This team report should be left out altogether or revised by a committee made up of a balanced representation of trail activists. This would include hikers, mountain bikers, runners, equestrians, the physically challenged and Native Americans, as well as other representatives. The SMMART process was supposed to bring together management agencies and a cross section of other groups to work together on trails issues. This Action Team failed to meet that criteria.

Good work. The ideas presented for new trail construction and existing trail improvement appear to be very useful for all users. I believe this inclusive approach will help serve to alleviate the fears and mistrust of certain users against others.

Comments Received on the Trail System Team Report

The content of the report is unchanged from the Draft Summary Report. Several comments were received commenting on the failure of the team to reach a consensus on the issue of providing guidance to land managers, suggesting the team re-do its work or that another team be established to address this issue. The team rejected these suggestions. The team felt they had gotten as far as they could with this issue at this time. They also felt their work product the team report and user statements would be useful to land management agencies regardless of whether a consensus had been reached. Additional comments

questioned the make up of the team, specifically the inclusion of the trail running user group and the absence of other individuals representing “multi-users”, environmental interests, and Native Americans, for example. The team did not address this issue. Future planning processes will have to make their own decisions regarding appropriate user group representation. The team did not consider other comments.

Comments include:

The bikers present an increasing danger to horses, especially on single track trails.

Regarding multiple use trails: it is clear that on single-track or enclosed trails, horses, their riders and hikers are subjected to significant risk due to the frequent high speed of cyclists. Where bikes generally do not constitute a hazard, excess speed, their use of narrow trails, sight limits, and increase in unsafe discourteous riding habits, and finally the lack of ability to enforce use have led to a fear on the part of many hikers and a large and increasing number of equestrians. While the bikers claim their sheer numbers entitle them to preferred use, they fail to understand that they have made equestrians so fearful that many of us cannot ride the trails on weekends and holidays when the volume of bikers is at its peak. Indeed, they have been parking their vehicles on the horse trail paralleling the Cheseboro road regularly during the warmer summer months, blocking the trail entirely from the horse, who are then forced into the road. In addition, the new fenced trail accessing Cheseboro park has no designation as of yet, and so many bikers have availed themselves of its use, terrorizing horses, and giving the horses no where to go to get away. As such it is clear that the fenced trail must be designated horses only. While bikers can be accommodated safely simply on city streets, a horse cannot. In other words, a biker is not limited in his pursuit by a limited number of legal trails, a horseman is. And so, by virtue of opportunity alone, certainly a measure of consideration must be afforded to the horse when a choice must be made. Certainly a large number of the trails are more than adequate to accommodate bikers, horses and pedestrians, however, where a choice must be made, it is clear that both safety and opportunity be weighed most heavily.

Since 1988, I have ridden over 20,000 miles in the Santa Monica Mountains. A highlight was the opening of the Rogers Road trail to bicycles, which allowed me a very nice alternative access to the park. Sections of the SMMART report transpire incompatibility between different types of trail users that is not in agreement with my vast experience. Personally, I have had many friendly chats with fellow bikers and hikers and never had any problems. I have heard of one incident where a cyclist got attacked by a hiker, but that does not mean we have to ban hikers from the trails. All trails currently open to cyclists and probably most closed ones can easily handle the mixed use. Closing trails to mountain bike use will only lead to overcrowding on the remaining open trails. There is an often overlooked benefit if trails are open to all users: in case of snake bite, mountain lion attack, sunstroke, etc. the occasional passing cyclist can potentially summon help much quicker than a hiker. Several times I have given water to hikers who did not plan appropriately. Like me, the typical cyclist is a 40ish professional not interested in downhill racing and stunts but interested in getting a good cardiovascular workout on the uphills, enjoying the nature, wildlife and changing seasons. I always start and end my ride at my house because it does not feel right to use a car to go to the trail head. I think this should be encouraged in order not to compete for parking spaces in the hillside communities. One way to facilitate such behavior is to have as many access points as possible (e.g., Rogers Road Trail).

As is obvious from the inability of this team to reach a consensus, there are many difficult issues associated with the question of which users should use which trails in the Santa Monica Mountains. As both a hiker (often with my small children) and mountain bicyclist, I see the potential conflicts from both sides. I feel strongly, however, that mountain bikes do belong in the Santa Monica Mountains trails, although clearly not on every trail. Mountain bikers generally constitute the largest user group in the Santa Monica Mountains, particularly given the close proximity of the mountains to urban and suburban areas of Los Angeles, it is important that they are accommodated. It is appropriate to set aside some trails for other users, but this needs to be done carefully as part of a strategic plan to achieve specific management goals. It is not appropriate for mountain bikes to be restricted more than they are currently as some members of the TST are advocating. Mountain bikers need more opportunity for riding the Santa Monica Mountains, not fewer. I support the bikes belong/share the trails vision as advocated by the mountain bicyclist representative on this team.

As a professional businessman and homeowner in Ventura County, I value the use of trails for mountain bike riding. It is a prime reason for residence in this area and quality of life. As a mountain biker, I adhere to the all trail use signs. Our bike group uses bike courtesy bells to alert other trail users of our presence in a non-aggressive way. We continually receive “thank you’s” and positive comments about our bells from equestrians and hikers in all the many areas we ride. We speak on the trails to equestrian and hikers and know that all equestrians and hikers are not against mountain bikers. I myself and we as a group are for more trails, more trail maintenance, and all access use for all people who include the use of the trail systems as something important and dear in their lives. The use of the trail systems is our right as individual citizens, not just as isolated individualistic groups. Mountain bikers love all!

I support the development of separate trails for hiking and off-road bicycling in the Santa Monica Mountains. I am a long time on-road bicyclist and hiker. As a cyclist and hiker, I have made a conscious decision not to ride a bicycle on hiking trails. In past hiking experiences, I have found that on narrow, single track trails, off-road cyclists and hikers cannot share the trails in a

highly used area. The large difference in speed between different users lead to a dangerous situation. On narrow trails, it is invariably the pedestrian that must move to accommodate the cyclist. A number of off-road cyclists do ride in a fashion that respects the hikers and does not seriously impact the quality of the trails. CORBA does work on trail maintenance and education of cyclists. However, not all cyclists are members of CORBA and some riders rapidly and unexpectedly encounter hikers and seriously degrade the edges of the trails. I am in favor of the development of wider trails that can accommodate cyclists passing hikers along the trails. This will allow shared access to some of the remote and scenic areas in the Santa Monica Mountains. The impact of bicyclists on specially-designed trails will be less than on trails designed for foot traffic. Hikers and cyclists do enjoy use of the same trail systems in other areas in the state. A majority of these locations require some travel time from large metropolitan areas. These areas are notable because of their low use. The Santa Monica Mountains, however, are very close to Los Angeles. Consequently, this area is used by a large number of people. It is the high traffic volume that warrants special consideration of the area. It is my hope that you will come to a good decision about the development and maintenance of the trail system in the Santa Monica Mountains. That decision should respect both the bicyclists and the hikers. As the growth in both hiking and cycling traffic increases, special care should be taken so that the trail system is not rendered useless or dangerous to the hiking community.

This team failed to do its job and this portion of the report should be discarded and the job should be done over. A new group should include: pedestrians (hikers and trail runners), equestrians, bicyclists, disabled and should include multi-users (many people ride and hike!). The group should be willing to compromise and work together.

To consider the wilderness closed to certain groups is wrong. It belongs to all! The truth of any trail use is 1) horses cause the most damage, 2) trail runners probably make up one percent of the people that use the trails. Over the Bars pays its dues in trail maintenance once a month along with the Mt. Wilson Mountain Bike group in maintaining and building the Ken Burton Trail and other trails. There are far more recreational mountain bike riders per week than any other group on the trails. Don't cater to the ones with the biggest mouths. But set them straight on who uses the trails and gives back to the trails the most.

In its present state, this section should be removed from the report. It only represents the opinions of [the individual team members]. SMMART from its inception was to seek solutions and to reach a consensus. This second group was formed with the commitment from its participants that they were working to that end. They did not honor this commitment. Further, during the December, 1996, SMMART meeting, the whole group agreed that this section was to present the issues of multiple use in a pro and con format. All but one participant was in favor. The participant who was against was asked at that meeting and at the next if she had any suggestions that would make this pro and con format acceptable to her. On both occasions, she stated she needed more time to think about it. As a participant in the SMMART process since its beginning, I vehemently oppose the inclusion of the statements on pages 72-82. These statements serve no purpose other than giving individuals a platform to state their opinions. If they are allowed to do so, the rest of the participants in SMMART should be given an equal opportunity to state their opinions. I recommend SMMART participants other than these four individuals be given the opportunity to form a third committee to identify the issues, present the pros and cons, and recommend solutions. I suggest that the participants in the third committee be individuals who wish to improve user experiences for the good of the Recreation Area and are able to see past their own preferences. Most of us get along on the trails. We just need to balance the SMMART process so that extremists cannot control the meetings.

I have lived in Conejo Valley for many years and have enjoyed most of the trails via all three disciplines examined, horse back, hiking and bicycle. I feel very privileged and lucky to live in an area with such great trails for multi-use. Naturally, I am very concerned after hearing of this study and the possible ramifications of this study on what I hold the highest regard as one of the biggest benefits of living in the Conejo valley, my privilege to ride my horse or bike in the Santa Monica Mountains. From my experience, 90% of the humans I encounter on the trails are mountain bikers. As a biker, I have always practiced respect and courtesy towards the trail and others when encountered. As a horse back rider, I have never had a bike encounter of a negative nature. When I horseback, if I hear bikes, then I announce my presence, even if it requires yelling "horse!" It's that easy. One single-track, bikers have yielded right of way very willingly to my steed and I. I'm actually more concerned about two horses passing on a single-track as they are wider and pack a nasty kick. I am not oblivious to the fact that one bad experience can ruin a whole day of good and that it's generally the carelessness of the few that negate all the positive efforts of the majority. I am hopeful that through the appropriate representation of all the interest groups that this study can find a mutually acceptable solution to the issues of multiple use trails that benefits all. Options I feel could work to the benefit of all user groups as listed in the study: whole access trails; physical obstacles to enforce use; selective/multiple use access; pay per use system for all user groups, not just mountain bikes; better enforcement/additional staffing; advertised trail maintenance days.

I have had the pleasure of reading the General Management Plan (GMP) for the National Recreation Area. Contained within its text are the NRA's enabling legislation as passed by Congress. The GMP speaks eloquently about promoting visitor use of the Santa Monica Mountains NRA. The words "creative" and "innovative" are used repeatedly. It plainly states the NPS is to, not only accommodate, but encourage new ways to use the parks so that as many people as possible can enjoy the land, without regard for race, color, creed, or mode of non-motorized transportation. No matter what this SMMART Draft Plan says now it must conform to the GMP. And my reading of the Code of Federal Regulations is that the GMP supersedes the CFR. While I have not read the GMP for the GGNRA (Golden Gate National Recreation Area), I have read the plan for the Santa Monica Mountains NRA. And, as we've heard the Santa Monica Mountains NRA plan clearly, magnificently mandates

expanding user opportunities and that the NPS be innovative and creative in doing so. The NPS has done just that. This SMART process has engaged a plethora of agencies, groups and individuals, boldly allowing widely divergent points of view to be aired, creating consensus on some issues and exposing the oft-times irrational opinions of an uncompromising few. Whatever form the final SMART Report takes I know that it will comply with the GMP - chalkfull of new, innovative, creative ways to encourage as many people as possible to enjoy their park - without regard to race, color, creed, or mode of non-motorized transportation.

I applaud everyone who contributed to the report. One and all, a job well done. Hidden in the report is unfortunately an anti-mountain biking sentiment. Many talented people may have had with mountain bikers will overshadow the fact that so many, in fact, more and more, people are finding mountain bikes an excellent way to enjoy the backcountry. All users are trying to accomplish the same goal: to enjoy nature. What is the purpose of horses in Southern California world? I assure you that no longer are people using horses for work or transportation. No, rather they use them for recreation. The same is true of bikes. Trying to restrict bikes because they are "machines" misses the point. Both horses and bikes are used to get from point A to B in an enjoyable fashion and to get to the point that one may not have been able to get to otherwise. One could argue that horses do not belong because they were not indigenous to the American continent. Even further, one could say that if every horse out there was allowed to eat a flower or eat the grass in the parks, there would not be anything left for anyone else. Is not the absurdity of this thinking apparent? Everyone wants to have a good time in the parks. No one group is going to disappear. We must all learn to get along and respect each other. In my years traversing the parks on bike, foot, and horse, I have seen a general increase in people's awareness of one another's rights. Don't let emotion over shadow fact or dictate policy. Regardless of how many times some well respected outdoors person may tell you the story of what happened years ago, the trust is more people are getting along with fewer and fewer exceptions. Education and positive examples are much more effective than legislation.

I firmly believe with the experiences I have had that it would present a real hazard with single track trails. With the unforeseen dangers as curves, blind spots, and dangerous riders (equine or bicycle), this could be an accident waiting to happen. To coexist peacefully, more enforcement of rules and regulations and dual track is a definite.

In trail encounters, personal inquiries about the use of trails by bikes found that most other users were not generally disturbed by bikes and are willing to share the trails, despite occasionally being annoyed by speeding bikers. The one individual providing the exception was not disturbed particularly by our group, but was generally unhappy with the presence of bikes period. Unfortunately, this attitude appears to represent unresolvable objections by some pedestrians and equestrians to the presence of mountain bikes on trails. This is despite the current existence of many trails not open to bikes and to me does not reflect a positive approach to the allocation of trail use. It seems reasonable to give the educational process of IMBA and the Mountain Bike Unit of CORBA time to influence the bike culture. In terms of trail damage, I would rank from worst to least, erosion, horses, bikes, pedestrians. In some cases, bikes have had a beneficial effect in smoothing the trail after winterflood waters produced serious disruption to the surface. If the main purpose of the park is to preserve natural conditions for traditional uses, the best approach is to close all areas to everyone so that the real traditional users (birds and animals) are left in peace. Of course, this is not a practical solution. In the foreseeable future, park administrators will be faced with providing methods of trail sharing by regulations acceptable to the maximum number of users. I wish them good luck!

[This team], while not reaching consensus, has rejected viable usage options for certain sensitive trails that could ease potential overuse and also help to resolve conflicting concept of park usage and purpose. I believe one or more of the following could work to the benefit of all: 1) alternative or designated day use. Suppose bike use were allowed/restricted alternate dates or even/odd dates on certain sensitive trails only. Hikers and equestrians would not be denied use on any days, but they could expect to share the trail with bikes on designated days. The bike users could then plan to use designated non-sensitive trails or fire roads on their restricted days. Initially the system could be on the honor system, with enforcement applied only as necessary. 2) Fee or permit for use. Trail use could be regulated while simultaneously providing financial resources for trail maintenance and regulation enforcement. A day-coded sticker could be attached to each bike or carried by each hiker or equestrian. If the bike stickers were numbered, trail use violations could be tracked. Violators could be first warned then fined or denied trail access. Designated day use allows sensitive users a chance to share trails or not and a permit system would be fairer than categorical denial of entry by a particular class of users (bikes) which is in my experience the largest user group. I have heard speculation that bike riders will invade trails in disregard of these rules, however, there are now and unfortunately always will be violators. In addition to potential monetary benefits, the fee or permit concept contains means to note outlaw behavior and apply sanctions.

[Agrees with the agreed upon options] because they make sense. Supports selective/multiple use access, strict enforcement, and improve signage. Would also like to see common courtesy between bicyclists and equestrians and all users.

I am an equestrian, I feel bikes do not belong on the trails as horses will spook at bikes always. When they come around a corner suddenly horses will always spook. I have seen horrible accidents where bikes have run right into horses. I also drive my horse cart in the park. I believe bikes should not be in the parks on the trails at all. There are more bikes than horses I realize, however, they cannot use the same trails. It makes most of the people who ride horses nervous when in the park wondering if a bike is going to be speeding around the corner. This is not a very relaxing or fun situation for equestrians.

Aside from the Pt Mugu hiking only area, the most frequently encountered users have been riding on a bicycle. I make this remark as a rider and family hiker in Chesebore Canyon, Malibu Creek, Point Mugu and other areas not under state or federal control. I have never had a negative experience meeting up with other users. In fact, the most frequent experience is where each of us is overly polite in yielding when the other is of a different mode. Common courtesy goes a long way. Mountain bike riding is what brought me to the parks first, the park experiences that I have had bring me back for hiking. I recently signed up for volunteer work through the Mountain Bike Unit. The rangers put on quite a program, emphasizing their goal of encouraging visitors. Discouraging bicycle access, I believe, would be a step back in delivering on that goal. While ultimately I think any such change would be short lived, I suggest that we avoid such a result in the first instance. I endorse the bikes belong/share the trails vision which treats the trail system as a shared resource and the trail users as a united community. I oppose the view that bikers can't safely share single-track trails and that the trails are for the enjoyment of a few users who are unwilling to share. Obviously, I support user education efforts. We must continue with the effort to make our parks known and accessible to all potential users, which promotion can only guarantee greater park development in the future.

Trail use should be restricted to hikers, equestrians, and runners on the narrow, existing trails!! There should be enforcement of whatever is decided. No use to have rules if no enforcement. I am tired of having my physical safety threatened by mountain bikers. Will it take fatalities for reason to prevail? I have to be prepared to jump off the trail at any moment. Why not consider on/off days - to argue "too hard to enforce" is no argument - because who will enforce the restricted use on all days?

As one of the coordinators for Trips for Kids, the CORBA sponsored program that takes underprivileged kids on mountain bike rides in the Santa Monica Mountains, I have a special interest in the outcome of your efforts. We at Trips for Kids work hard to help educate them on the importance of respecting nature and the local park system in particular, in addition to making them aware of the rules and etiquette of mountain bike riding on shared trails and count on access to local trails. During my involvement with this program, I have seen only positive responses from our hiking and horse back riding counterparts.

We wholeheartedly support the bikes belong/share the trails vision presented by our mountain bike representative. This vision offers the most users the most opportunities. It disperses use. It allows for education and socialization of new users. It protects resources at every level. Perhaps most importantly, it is fact-based. Local and national studies on safety, environmental impact, user conflict, and user numbers all support the bikes belong/share the trails vision. It is saddening to us that there are still those who think the trails of the NRA should be their private county club to the exclusion of other responsible users. We don't think the views expressed by the equestrian and pedestrian members of the TST reflect what is actually happening on the trails. SMMART was an arduous process. We participated in good faith. While we were frequently frustrated and disappointed by the anti-bike sentiment expressed by certain individuals, we are unwavering in our commitment to the Santa Monica Mountains NRA and our place in it.

We are disappointed that the TST could not work together. Despite the rhetoric involved, our experience in hiking and riding multi-use trails in the Santa Monica Mountains has been that riders, hikers, and equestrians get along far better on the trail than in meetings. It appears to us that the results of the team were highly dependent on the individual personalities and agendas of the participants. We question the logic of splitting the pedestrian users into hikers and runners. This gave an extra voice to pedestrians not in line with the profile of actual users of trails. Multi-use trails are easier for land managers to patrol, are inherently safer for users as they have the benefit of help from other users and bike patrols in the event of accidents. The team could have benefited from a more factual review of issues such as safety and the relative impacts of users on trails. Did the facilitator supply that information? The user groups should have included multi-users. These one-person multi-users could have brought a more tempered experience to the discussion. The NPS seems bent on forcing users into one group or another. The survey at Simi Hills ignored the 72 users who checked more than one use. This multi-use group was likely larger than the trail running and equestrian user groups combined. Before considering closing trails to certain users, the land managers should consider conducting in-the-field walks, rides, etc. to sample what's actually happening. 95% of the users of Chesebore rated their experience as "good" or "excellent" which contradicts the position taken by pedestrians on the team that many users are unhappy. The safety arguments propounded by pedestrians to support closing of single track trails to cyclists are not supported by the facts which show that most cyclist accidents involve only cyclists and the few that do involve pedestrians take place on fire roads, not single track. The NPS seems inconsistent in its rules concerning human powered recreational apparatus. The NPS does not ban canoes and kayaks. We have polled our many members and all have found that the vast majority of hiker/equestrian/biker interactions have been friendly. There were two exceptions, both where hikers abusively and inappropriately threatened bike riders riding on marked multi-use trails. Clearly some people don't know how to get along, no matter what the situation. There are credible studies that bike use on properly designed trails cause no more damage than lug soled hiking boots and far less damage than horses. Users of Santa Monica Mountains NRA know that the majority of damage comes from Mother Nature in the form of winter rains. This problem can be alleviated by education of users to avoid use after a rainfall and improved trail design with proper sloping and drainage. Park rangers and maintenance crews should also avoid driving trucks on trails after heavy winter rains. The report ignores benefits of bike use enjoyed by other users: trail maintenance and building by cyclists, patrols by MBU that promote safety, and help and assistance rendered to equestrians or pedestrians. While conservation of resources should be the prime consideration for any land manager, a Recreation Area so close to an urban setting is different than a National Park or Wilderness and should expect and provide for

more and varied use. Riding of single track trails by cyclists can be an appropriate use of trails - even the Sierra Club has agreed with this. Mountain bikes are environmentally friendly. They don't pollute, are quiet and offer varied recreational uses. Some use bikes for family outings, physical fitness, and developing technically riding skills. Our riders use their bikes as tools (like a knapsack or boots) to allow them to explore more backcountry than is accessible on foot. They enjoy wildlife viewing, seeing and identifying flowers, plants, and birdwatching, as well as the pure experience of bike riding. The comments concerning the evils of the "billion dollar bike industry" ignore the fact that the industry has been successful because people want to ride mountain bikes. It would be equally absurd to blame litter caused by pedestrians on Nike. The NPS loses some credibility with cyclists when it permits commercial saddle animal packers in National Parks, which are highly injurious to trails and meadows, but does not permit bikers. We suggest the following multi-use guidelines for Santa Monica Mountains NRA: all newly constructed trails should be designed for and designated multiple use; to accommodate pedestrians, certain trails might be left 'hiker/riders' only particularly those in sensitive areas or that are extremely steep or poorly constructed; land managers should consider natural usage patterns by hikers, cyclists, handicapped and equestrians which do differ. Hikers and handicapped tend to stay closer to trail heads, equestrians and cyclists range further. Trails less appropriate for certain use might be signed "not suggested for (hikers/cyclists/equestrians)" but compliance would be voluntary. COSCA does this.

As Vice President of the Over the Bars Mountain Bike Club, I feel that by limiting the amount of trails used by bikes will only congest the other trails, causing more accidents to occur or increase the risk of it occurring. Also, as an active member of the Mt. Wilson Bicycling Association, I personally have had to repair many trails damaged by horses... not bicyclists. And by doing trail work, I have noticed that more trails, primarily single track trails, have less overgrowth when left open to cyclists. With funding being cut for trail upkeep, and cyclists able to ride most trails, there less trail closures caused by overgrowth. As a cyclist and hiker, I enjoy all trails and feel they should be open to all who want to use them.

I do not understand how those who advocate getting bikes off trails can justify their thinking. I suppose it is because the equestrians and hikers formerly had the trails to themselves and now are understandingly unhappy with the new mountain bike participant - unhappy because it is not their private domain any more! I find that bikes are now the predominate visitor - if I were just a hiker I would probably not be overjoyed with this intrusion, but certainly wouldn't say "get rid of them". Although I have seen occasional evidence of bike abuse in the parks, the vast majority of riders recognize the fact they are not the only users and ride accordingly. Banning all bikes from certain trails is akin to keeping everyone off of the freeways because of a few irresponsible drivers. If there were only some way that new bikers had to complete a training course before hitting the trails... for from my observation, it is primarily the newcomers who break the rules. It just doesn't seem right to rid the trails of the biggest user because of a few mavericks among us. I have found some hikers and equestrians on the trails not exactly acting like angels either, but that doesn't mean they should all be banned! I like the idea of trail standards, finishing missing trail segments, and providing trail camps along the Backbone Trail but not with the exclusion of bikes that some propose.

I can understand the concerns of hikers, runners, and equestrians. The large influx of mountain bikers in the last decade has crowded the trails. But by no means does any group have the right to bar any other group from a recreational area. This is a give and take situation, not take away one. The group I work with donates hours of trail maintenance annually. We have the right to enjoy the trails.

My overall impression is that there is almost no user conflict in the parks. Like everyone else, I have encountered thoughtless users. I am also a member of CORBA and was quite interested in the SMMART process. I attended several meetings and was very impressed with [the facilitator's] ability. Nevertheless, it became clear to me that the majority of participants in the process were part of a very small minority, particularly biased toward one point of view, and not representative of the overall group of users they purport to represent. It appears that such participants have been successful in thwarting the objectives of SMMART, i.e., to form a consensus with which the land managers could devise a comprehensive plan for their areas that would address the needs of all park users, while at the same time preserve those areas for future generations. I would urge you to carefully consider the needs of all park users and the actual state of affairs in the parks before making any decisions based on input received from certain individuals who seem to be more interested in their own personal agenda than in working with other park visitors to make the experience enjoyable for all. I believe you truly want to make the Santa Monica Mountains a place where the largest possible constituency of users can make the most of the recreational, historical, and scenic resources of the area.

As a Sierra Club member, I believe the Santa Monica Mountains should be open to all people. However, when access by one group infringes on enjoyment and safety of others, a reasonable compromise should be reached. Mountain bikes on narrow hiking trails present a real hazard to individual and group hikers. They have been serious accidents and near-accidents occurring on such trails. Just the other day I was involved in a near-accident with a biker and that happened on a wide fire road. The narrow and twisting nature of hiking trails make it very dangerous for both hikers and mountain bikers. Mountain bikers have access to all the fire roads in the Santa Monica Mountains and that should be the case. Several areas exist where there is a definite conflict between mountain bicyclists and hikers. The Rogers Ridge Trail in Pacific Palisades is a steep, narrow, and twisting and presents a serious danger to both groups using the trail simultaneously. It should be restricted to hikers only. The Wood Canyon Vista Trail in Point Mugu is a single-track trail and a part of the Backbone Trail. For the same reasons, this trail should be closed to bikers. In fact, the entire length of Sycamore Canyon fire and ranch road) has been

overrun by bikes and is an intolerable situation. Bikers go very fast and lose control of their bikes, endangering hikers. The only trail, the Backbone Trail from Castro Crest to Kanan Dume Road (including Newton Canyon Trail,) should be closed to bikes. Heavy bike traffic is driving away hikers and walkers. Please consider these factors when making your decision on trail use and access.

Since this team did not reach a consensus and made no recommendations, I believe the entire section should be stricken from the final Summary Report. Unless a consensus of representative users can be achieved, presenting several points of view is counterproductive. With respect to the TST report, I generally agree with the options the team reached agreement on. I strongly believe in the education, enforcement and staffing options suggested. It has been my experience that most users get along and share a mutual appreciation of their access to the park. Some users need to be educated as to the needs and perceptions of other users. The primary source of any conflicts I have experienced is the preconceived attitude of some users who seem to be seeking confrontation. I've seen equestrians run other users off the trail, frighten hikers by walking their horse up to them, and not responding to requests. I've seen groups of hikers deliberately blocking trails and walking off trail. I've seen bicyclists riding too fast for the conditions. If these actions were unintended, education is the answer. If they were deliberate, enforcement is called for. Nevertheless, these instances were rare and can be best addressed through better education and peer pressure.

Green sticker for mountain bikes \$20 for 2 years. Must pass a simple test of rules for trails. Must have a sticker on bike or get a ticket.

Most users who go over a mile from the trailhead have a major interest in exercise. My bike offers me the same experience without the physical stress on my legs and feet [as hiking and running]. I average about the same speed on the bike as I do when running, but I can go three times as far with the same level of exhaustion. I need the mix to preserve my body. Most trail users I encounter are not experiencing peace and tranquillity, they are talking non-stop. I do not think that is bad, but I think reality is important in trail user issues. Equestrians are in another category. A major part of their experience is managing a powerful animal whose natural instincts are to flee from any perceived threat, whether a plastic bag, a tree, trail runners, trail workers carrying tools and yes, bicycles. Serious equestrians pride themselves on training their mounts to accept these perceived threats, with the possible exception of bikes. [Physical improvements: supports 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 and maybe 9.] With new construction, take care to make significant initial portions of the trail accessible, take advantage of ranch/utility roads to increase our trails and disperse trail users. Efforts must be made to disperse users from busy trailheads to minimize conflicts. Stairs are a last resort for trail construction except on the shorter, close in trails. Steps further out on the trail are usually a necessity because of the terrain and therefore should be used. Parallel trails should be built in some locations. Would go further than the bicyclist comment and would add areas where conflicts are frequent. These areas usually have their environment already compromised by over-use and dual trails could make things less unpleasant. Pullover zones will not occur at the right places. Underutilization of these areas quickly overgrows; observe the Guadalupe Trail. Vista points and rest stops are desirable to keep the trail clear from trail users that are passing by. [Regulating Trail Use: supports 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. On-off days too difficult to implement. Users would arrive and find they had not planned for the off days and go anyway. It would encourage disregard of the rules. Bikes should not be singled out for restriction. permit/license would require an expensive bureaucracy. I would not want to participate. Make criteria for group size limits known. It probably can't be enforced, but courtesy criteria could be established. I do not like to encounter groups of over ten or so, no matter the type of user. Yes, if carrying capacity can be controlled easily say by the limitation of parking spaces. Better enforcement but not at the expense of sufficient trails and adequate maintenance of trails. In reality, that probably means no. [Allocating trail use: supports 4, 6, 9, 10, 12]. Bicyclists need more trail riding opportunities. We should be encouraging the young adults bicyclists to join in the expansion and preservation of our open space. If trails were closed to horses and the hikers and riders did not wear shoes it may be OK to exclude bikes too. Most trails should be multiple-use as they are in the COSCA open space. The trail users are working it out. If equestrians can train their mounts to accept the many things that spook horses, they can train them to deal with bikes. There are trails that are not appropriate for horses and bikes for many reasons and a dangerous hazard is one of them. Less restriction is appropriate for bicyclists because the rider can always get off and carry the bike around a hazard. Signs can indicate those places. Use zones: There does not appear to be recognition of the wilderness areas in this report. I frequent Pt Mugu where there is a large wilderness area. I know I can go there and not find bicyclists. I accept the significant interruption to my running when I encounter horses. When I catch up from behind I have to be particularly careful not to surprise the horse. On narrow trails I have a major problem passing when approaching from behind. I accept and understand horses feel more secure in groups even though it conflicts with my use of the trail. Bikes should be allowed on Backbone Trail where not in wilderness and where it would not be too dangerous. The design of the Backbone Trail should meet a higher standard for safety because it is the centerpiece trail of the Santa Monica Mountains. Regional trails should be managed like the successful COSCA trails. Riding single track trails is particularly interesting and often presents a technical challenge. I am not talking about speed but maneuvering. The trail damage caused by bikes is minimal and usually a trail design fault or a terrain problem that could not be designed around to alleviate bike skidding damage. These areas are relatively few and damage is easily corrected. Single track trails that range far from access points are so underused that they get overgrown and suffer erosion damage because crews do not get out to maintain them. Usually few users care about these trails. Where bikes are permitted, the overgrowth is kept partially at bay and bikes actually pack the trails smooth in most sections of the trails in this climate. The effect is that frequent use of a trail maintains the tread and keeps vegetation from growing in the tread. A greater effort is needed by the park organizations to integrate all the trail users

to do trail maintenance work. Bikes are a growing resource for this effort and their concern for these remote trails will help immensely. Non-destructive periodic sports events should be permitted and should pay for the opportunity. I assume this is the issue here. If the issue is not to allow any non-powered devices I disagree. If someone wants to carry a skateboard up the Guadalupe Trail to ride down that is fine as long as they ride responsibly and under control. [Mitigating/Reducing Conflict: supports 1, 2, 3, and 4] I disagree that trail etiquette was not an issue before bikes. Equestrians have not become a major conflict because of their relatively small number. Would the rules be changed if more equestrians used the trails? We need the emotional, political, monetary and physical support of more and more trail users. Desensitization: this is the focus of all the conflict. I have no conflict with bikes when I am running the trails. I do not yield and I thank the majority of bikers that stop well ahead of me to yield. The biker is more vulnerable than a runner because a small bump on the handlebar could cause the bike to have a major problem, especially on a major trail. If the rider slows significantly and the trail is wide enough I will move over, without stopping, for a simple pass. I have had head-on surprises from other runners on occasion but I don't demand that all trails be one way. I consider myself a trail runner, but I disagree with almost everything that was said by the [trailrunner representative]. Educate users re yield: I take exception to the equestrians and hikers who say that all bike riders are discourteous because I am courteous. Don't change the kind of signs COSCA uses because they are clear.

Although most bicyclists are quite courteous, I just don't think it is safe for people, bikes and horses to share trails. I've patrolled (MAU) Happy Camp and consistently ride Chesebore Canyon and I've had several bikes ride up from behind unannounced. I've also experienced bicyclists going so fast that they have lost control and flipped over their bikes when they saw us coming around a blind curve. I would hate to see anyone get hurt when there is enough room for trails for all sports.

The use of mountain bicycles on park trails should be by permit only, showing that they have completed a course in hiker and equestrian safety. Without the permit, they shouldn't be allowed on the trails because they have proven themselves to be a hazard to other trail users. Safety and enjoyment are important, with or without a helmet.

As an avid hiker and also a cyclist, I would request that all trails be shared by all parties. We surely can enjoy the environment by exercising together in our own way. Remember that cyclists are perhaps the only group that get to the trails by their own power. Other users arrive by automobile causing additional pollution of the atmosphere. I also think that in my area the greatest amount of donated trail repair time etc. has come from the cycling community. Please adopt a shared use trail policy.

Pullover zones are unrealistic. Bicycles will not stop for hikers or equestrians in between pullover zones. On-off times/days user groups have different needs; bicycle restrictions on single track trails an important need for hikers or pedestrians.

Mountain bicycling is a downhill sport. Mountain bicycles compromise the backcountry experience and the resources. They displace historical trail users who are more environmentally friendly. Further, the possibility of meeting a speeding bicyclist on any trail creates an ambiance of anxiety, worry, and stress for people who go to the parks for a relaxed experience to get away from stresses and worries. The mountain bikers are happy to share trails because it has been shown that eventually the many other trail users will be driven off the trails that they use.

First, I think the project itself was an insightful process to get the concerned parties together and working toward the common goal of improving the trail networks in the Santa Monica Mountains. The area does need coordination between the various agencies who manage the land. My use of the area is primarily mountain biking, but I occasionally hike. My experiences with other users has been positive for the most part. I have had problems with hikers deliberately blocking roads and trails, but those instances have been few. I was bothered, but not surprised by the lack of consensus among the Trail System Team. Bikes belong on the trails and should not be excluded. I believe the biker users also should be permitted on single-track trails. The best example of various users peacefully co-existing is in the land managed by COSCA. In that area, the various users share the numerous single-track trails with little conflict or hostility. The user statements by the equestrians and hikers reflect a view that only those "historic" users should be permitted on the single-track trails and bikes should be restricted to fire roads. This exclusionary view of the uses of an area should not determine the current uses because such a historic policy implicitly restricts bicycles. Such restrictions would only exacerbate another problem that those user groups complain of: overcrowding. By restricting bikes to a limited number of fire roads, the density of use will be increased and more conflicts will erupt. Bicyclists are a legitimate user group of the Santa Monica Mountains and they should have access with the other user groups.

The proposal to limit mountain bikes from single tracks and even fire roads doesn't make sense. The majority of users in the Santa Monicas are mountain bikers. Mountain bikes don't do anywhere near the damage to trails that horses do. Bikes don't take up that much space, not much more than a hiker. What needs to be done is open more trails to bikes, which would alleviate traffic from trails such as Rogers Road. Los Angeles is a huge city. It's entirely unfair for the "traditional user groups" to try to exclude "outlaw" mountain bikers. The Santa Monicas are big enough for everyone to enjoy.

As a mountain biker, hiker and one who lives and frequents the Santa Monica Mountains trails, I support a plan which would provide shared access of the Santa Monica Mountains trail network for these uses. Furthermore, the development of trail construction standards should reflect the needs of both hikers and bicyclists. I further support a plan which limits adjacent development (e.g., through land procurement and/or restrictions) and limits motor vehicle access (e.g., limited to emergency and/or park service vehicles).

The "disabled" person has the best outlook of all. The people who couldn't agree should have been thrown out of the SMMART (oxymoron!) process. No report is better than this one. How is it that "trail runners" are now a separate user group? I don't think this is warranted. Bad idea! The anti-share people involved in the SMMART (unfortunate acronym) coordination (?) process effort are, for the most part, the same individuals who have been anti-bike since day 1. These people represent a very small, very loud minority of park users who do not represent the opinions or experiences of the great majority. Please recognize that oiling the "squeaky wheel" at the expense of all the rest of us does not solve conflicts, real, imagined, or implied.

We run the trails 3-5 x per week and mountain bike 1-2 x per week. Throughout the years we have seen the park usage change from mainly hikers to more mountain bikers than any other user group. Part of our responsibility as CORBA members is to keep track of our patroller's statistics who record the actual number of hikers, bikers, and equestrians in the parks. The statistics have supported this change in user groups. We have also been mare of comments from a few users complaining about the inability of all groups to successfully share the trails. In all of our experiences he have not found this to be true. We believe that bikers, hikers, runners, and equestrians can share the trails. There are a number of single-track trails that are multi use that we frequent both as runners and hikers, including Guadalupe and Wood Canyon trails in Pt Mugu, the connector trail in Chesebore Canyon, the Rogers/Backbone Trail, and the Backbone section between Kanan and Corral Canyon. 95% of the experiences we have had with other users have been positive. Most of the users are happy to be out in the mountains. On occasion we have met irresponsible hikers as well as bikers. It is our feeling that there are a few users who do not use the trails responsibly and it is important that these people are educated (this is one of the jobs that the MBU and CORBA have been actively working on). We do then endorse the "bikes belong/share the trails". We believe too that an important part of this whole issue is how the trails are constructed to accommodate users. Two good examples of this are the Guadalupe and Chesebore Connector. The other trails mentioned above can also accommodate all three user groups and have done so successfully. We applaud your efforts for taking on such a task. We would hope that you will take into consideration the needs of all the users not only those who make the most noise. The statistics show that the majority of users are at the moment mountain bikers and those same statistics will show that all of the users can co-exist successfully

We applaud SMMART's efforts to improve and enhance coordination between trail managing agencies and all other groups concerned. We are confident that your efforts will provide a better trail experience for all trail users. We as Trail Runners would like you to understand how we feel about the other trail users, so that we will be fairly represented in your groups. We enjoy sharing trails with other users and are grateful that the trails are open to many different types of users. We have passed and been passed by many different types of users with very few problems. The majority of users are friendly, polite and we all use common sense and courtesy when passing or being passed. When a biker does pass they do yield by slowing down and making sure it is okay to pass. In instances where we are going in opposite directions, many times they stop and move out of the way. The problems we have had are with the persons themselves, not how they are using the trail. Hikers won't move out of the way, other runners won't move over, bikers speed by or don't let you know they are passing and on occasion equestrians almost run you over. All of these are rare and are all because of the person and not their mode of transportation. It is unfortunate that these people are out there and I'm sure that other users will educate them in the proper use of trails. What would be unfair is to close any multi-use trails because of a few bad seeds. Many of us use trails as hikers and bikers when not running so we have a good perception of what happens on trails. We hope this will assist you in your planning and that you will understand our position as trail runners in the Santa Monica Mountains. When deciding on when a trail should be multi-use, we hope you will consider the environmental issues, size of trail, access and the safety of all users. The decision of any trail being open should be based on this criteria, not the personal feelings of any one user.

The failure of SMMART to reach consensus on multiple use issues is a disappointment. I think we all hoped the SMMART dialogue would give land managers a clear mandate. Since it didn't, I hope that the land managers will now exert leadership that is required to provide more opportunities for responsible trail cyclists. We have been waiting a very long time. Cyclists have been on the trails and roads of the Santa Monica Mountains since the late 1960s. The success of the mass produced mountain bike in 1982 led to a boom in the number of riders to current levels. In 1986-87, the three major land managers imposed restrictions on bicycle use on trails. Like land managers nationwide, they were unsure of the impacts of mountain bicycles on park resources. They were not sure if bicycles would contribute to the tradition of volunteerism established in the Santa Monica Mountains. They had received complaints from other visitors worried about safety. A small number of traditional users felt bikes as wheeled machines didn't belong in the park. There was no organized group of mountain cyclists. In 1987, CORBA formed. Each of the big 3 land managers acknowledged the legitimacy of mountain bicycling in the NRA, offered to work with CORBA and began a number of programs to manage bikes. Most notable with the Mountain Bike Unit, created in 1988, which contributed 14,700 hours of volunteer time to the NRA in 1996. Now, ten years later, we're in a better position to assess bike impacts and the relative merits of different management policies. Trail cyclists are one of the largest groups of trail users but we have access to the smallest number of existing trails. While most fire roads are open to cyclists, most single-track trails are not. Experienced cyclists, like experienced hikers and equestrians, value close-in nature experience of these trails. All major land managers in the Santa Monica Mountains allow bikes on some single-track trails. In 1994, the national Sierra Club acknowledged that "mountain bicycling is a legitimate form of recreation and transportation on trails, including single-track, when and where it is practiced in an environmentally sound and socially responsible manner." It is clear to me from personal experience on trails that on the trails people are getting along. Studies support this point of view. The University of Idaho study, the Simi Hills plan, and the Zuma Canyon plan all indicate a general satisfaction with the

trail experience. It is agonizing to me to know this and then to be the target of complaints and hostility at meetings. It's understandable though. There have been several studies of user conflict that conclude the perception of problems are created by the multiple complaints and the solicited complaints of a small group of people. It is clear to me that this has been happening here. COSCA confronted the same issues and the land managers gave a clear message to their visitors to learn to share the trails and get along. In my opinion, it is the lack of such a message from NPS, CDPR, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy that has allowed the anti-bicycle position in the Santa Monica Mountains to fester. A small % of people apparently feel if they complain loudly and often enough and obstruct processes of change, they'll eventually be able to exclude cyclists. One of the problems has been that some of the anti-bike folks feel they have nothing to lose by holding out against bikes. I hope they're wrong and that SMMART has at least aired the issues to the satisfaction of the land managers. I hope NPS, CDPR, and Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy will deliver the message COSCA did: "Share the Trails". It is time to open the trails. There are a lot of us. We need them. We're considered legitimate. Demonstrably our environmental impacts and safety records are acceptable. Educational efforts of all types are underway. Below is an array of alternatives ordered on a continuum of what I perceive offers most to least access to trail cyclists. In my opinion we want to move from #5 to #2 Cyclists need more trails. I'd like to see us get them without cutting back on trail opportunities for others, but if they can't share, its time to consider options like #3 and #4 which would reallocate trails. Anything below #2, we all lose. #1) All shared use alternative (every trail multiple use); #2) Mostly shared use with some separate areas for specific management considerations (e.g., bikes and horse may be prohibited from some nature or whole access trails, separate feeder trails from crowded trail heads, designate certain trails in major parks "hiker only" to give opportunity to folks who can't stand the sight of bicycles). #3) All separate use with the allocation based on the percentage of users (current statistics place bikes at 60% of users, they would get 60% of single-tracks, pedestrians and horses prohibited from them and cyclists from the other 40%); #4) All separate use, the 50-50 solution; #5) Mostly hiker and horses on trails with some shared trails for specific management considerations (this is status quo). #6) Pedestrian and horse only. #7) Pedestrians only. I would urge land managers to begin planning for #2. It is the only plan that will work in the long run.

Bicycles should be allowed only on trails 8 ft or wider. This will allow safe passage for hikers, equestrians, and cyclists. This is appropriate for all wheeled vehicles. Bicycles are not only unsafe on narrow trails, they ruin the sense of serenity that nature provides. I have been hiking and high speed bicyclists have attempted to pass on a narrow trail. I have been on horseback and had a bike skid under my horse because at high speed the cyclist was unable to avoid an equestrian at a blind corner. These experiences spoil a sense of peace that I attempt to find when hiking or riding a horse.

After more than two years of an extremely contentious project, we have a draft report that reflects the nature of the process. At the outset, I was excited about the opportunity to participate in such a potentially far reaching project. An endeavor that would help mold the Santa Monica Mountains NRA policies for the benefit of the entire park using public for generations to come. A project that could have helped to build a strong constituency for park that has many of its strongest supporters spending too much time fighting among each other when there are far more important adversaries of the park itself. The greatest disappointment in the SMMART project came from the loss of focus on the "bigger" picture and overall mission of the process, allowing people from various user factions to focus on their own agendas. The project almost immediately took an ugly turn when certain people decided that the focus of the SMMART process should be why bikes do not belong in the park. This negative attitude is reflected in the summary document and is truly unfortunate. These people are to be commended for the willingness to volunteer their time to the process. However, their attitudes are problematic for several key reasons: 1) they do not reflect what is actually happening in the parks. 2) it reflects attitudes that are out of touch with the park using public. 3) these attitudes could exacerbate a problem that is currently limited to a relatively small number of people. This project was a contentious effort in trying to build a unified trail community. Unfortunately, a few people's selfish agendas dominated the process. You are to be commended for taking on such a difficult task. No amount of preparation or warning could have changed the fractionalized nature of the constituency in the Santa Monica Mountains.

This team in theory agreed to everything except bicycle usage of the parks. The report is the ultimate "us versus them" document. The attitudes represented in the report represent the opinions of a few and not the reality of what is happening (reference to the University of Idaho study). To say that etiquette problems did not exist prior to the introduction of mountain bicycles is far fetched at best. Fact based information indicates that overall park usage is up, not driving users away as some would like us to believe. The attitudes represented in the equestrian, hiker, and runner reports are not based in fact, nor do these people represent the majority of park users. If the mission of the parks is to protect resources while providing for the recreational opportunities then exclusionary policies as suggested by the hikers, equestrians, and runners do not meet this criteria. By restricting bicycles to "some" fire roads the parks will be faced with even greater enforcement and safety problems. Roads by definition are wide and have less grade to them. Regardless of what the speed limit may be, people will have the perception of the ability to travel at a greater rate of speed. By opening more trails to bicycles, it will disperse park users. This will create less opportunity for accidents and enforcement problems. It will also enhance the park experiences for all users. Bicycles are a legitimate park user and will continue to be a large constituency. It is time to end the us versus them attitudes and realize that we all need to get along and work together for the greater benefit of all park users.

The situation in Cheeseboro Canyon National Park is often very dangerous. I've had bikers who were coming down narrow blind curves have to slam on their brakes and slide to a stop. Of course this will sometimes frighten the horse who spins out on steep hillsides. No one is at fault but the combination doesn't always work well. I've also enjoyed biking in the park so I can see

the plight of equestrians and bikers. A solution might be to mark separate trails and educate bikers on horse behavior.

I believe no one group or groups should have the exclusive use of the Santa Monica Mountains trails. If there are adjacent trails serving an area I think each could be set aside for different types of use but not based on trail width, etc. This could be done in some areas but not others. Education and patrols could reduce most conflicts on multi-use trails. More and more older (than 50) people such as myself use bikes as exercise because running is bad for our legs. Don't deny us as a group the use of roads and single track trails because of the action of a few. We love and revere the natural beauty of the mountains also.

The trail I usually ride on has hikers, bikers, occasionally horses, and joggers, all of whom share the trail without major problems. There is no reason to assume that any one class of users is any better or worse for the environment as there are responsible and irresponsible users in each category, and none should be denied access for the transgressions of the few. Education and monitoring are the answer for compatible operations. Mountain biking is a growing sport and should not be eliminated, other than from areas that specifically could be environmentally degraded. This should be narrowly construed, rather than broadly, as some of the anti-mountain biking groups would like. Barring automobiles from the highways could clearly improve the environment, but it is not the correct solution. The TST apparently did not reach a conclusion, but I believe there is the ability to share the trails and to work together with organizations like CORBA to see that trails are properly maintained.

It is shocking, horrifying and hideous that commercial lobbyists such as REI have such a grip on the public resources of our area. I will never use REI again. It is up to the Park Services to set the standards for our parks and be loud and vocal when either our own governments put pressure on them, or lobbyists for commercial interests do. Our trails are threads of the past, leading us into a reality of which we are a part and of which only nature speaks. Trails need to be managed as if they were living arteries of one organism. Uses need to be mixed and matched, changed around, disconnected and always priorities given to "how can we maximize the living ecosystems and allow people to participate and enjoy?" Some areas have to be completely cutoff. These are the principles which our tax dollar supports: 1) to preserve ecosystems for the 7th generation; 2) to endorse only low impact uses; 3) man made things belong in man made places; 4) motorcycles only in motorcycle parks; bicycles fire roads only and limited in number; horses limited use so as to preserve trails; foot hikers any open trails. I cannot tell you the many times I have been nearly killed by a bicyclist scaring my horse or nearly running into me when I've been on foot.

I enjoy the outdoors and consider myself a mountain bicyclist/hiker I hear these people say that you cannot enjoy the trails on a mountain bike well I think that is crazy! I enjoy the trails on my bike at least 3 times a week. I think all areas and trails should be open to mountain bikes. This will help disburse the amount of riders and will reduce the amount of conflicts. Keep in mind that mountain bikers are putting in lots of hours of trail work.

I believe (due in part to the efforts of IMBA) that most mountain bikers are responsible and deserve equal access to the trail system. To my knowledge, there has not been an epidemic of injuries due to bike/pedestrian accidents. As with any group of people there is a minority of bikers who are not considerate. I believe it is wrong to limit a whole group for the actions of a few. I recognize the desire of hikers to have some solitude and not have to worry about bikes. That's why I believe some trails should be off-limits to mountain bikes. Most trail users would agree to a system where some single-track trails are multi-user and some restricted would be a fair solution. Current all but a few single-track are restricted. I hope that the SMMART process recognizes the rights of the large and growing number of mountain bikers by opening up more trails for multi-use. While the vocal minority of dogmatics from the other user groups may not like it, this is the only equitable solution.

Although I use the trails for multiple purposes, my biggest concern is the risk "high-speed" mountain bikes pose for the equestrian, runners and hikers, especially on the narrow and/or single track trails. Is there any way to separate or restrict bikes on narrow trails? Mountain bikers still need to be educated about how to pass horses on the trail.

For your information, my interest in this project relates to making sure that handicapped issues are considered during the planning process. My volunteer group, Ranch Riders, is interested in linking Indiana University's "Easy Access Park Challenge" to the Santa Monica Mountains NRA (to the extent no one else is already doing so - I note that the EAPC program was not mentioned in the summary report). If you are unfamiliar with the EAPC, you may wish to check out IU's National Center for Accessibility at <http://www.indiana.edu/~nca> NCA appears to be the perfect organization to address these issues as the NCA was created through a cooperative agreement between Indiana University and the National Park Service.

Although my involvement went from total to non-existent in the last few months, I was certainly aware of the difficulties faced in mediating the TST. It is unfortunate that certain individuals made a mockery of the process and did nothing more than impede a process which was meant to examine alternatives, nothing more. I am particularly disappointed in the lack of character of the Santa Monica Mountains NRA NPS representatives. When all was said and done, they literally sat back and took a non-committal position that neither defined multiple use nor presented alternatives. It was glaringly apparent they were trying to pass off their responsibilities as a managing agency to the public in hopes that a consensus would be formed so that they wouldn't have to take any heat for any definitive decisions regarding multiple use. How many times did COSCA/COSTAC representatives state that multiple use works in COSCA, only to be bombasted by anti-bike people with no clue

whatsoever as to what it's like to coexist in a multiple use backcountry. NPS is now suggesting that the SMMART findings should be adopted by all agencies within the SSMNRA, including COSCA. As a board member of COSTAC, that suggestion is totally laughable. I seriously question the decision to include a 'trail runner' user segment. To subdivide the pedestrian group was a terrible mistake. Why not divide the equestrian group into 'riders who stop a lot' and 'riders who ride hard and fast and don't stop at all' and the pedestrian group even further into 'walkers only' and 'walkers who are also bird watchers'. For this reason alone, the whole SMMART draft should be disregarded. At the onset of the SMMART process, I warned [the facilitator] that this was unlike any group [she] had dealt with. About halfway through I sensed she realized this and to her credit she did everything she could to salvage the process. From what I could see, she was left swinging in the wind by Santa Monica Mountains NRA NPS staff. They should be ashamed, not only of their behavior towards her but of the lack of decisiveness they have shown through the entire process.

I am concerned about the use of trails in the Santa Monica Mountains by mountain bikers. It is evident that the use of bikes in this area has already greatly altered hikers' ability to safely hike in the mountains and to enjoy the freedom of their hiking. Hikers already are not able to use all the trails as they did in the past because there are areas they are no longer able to safely hike; alone or with others. It is extremely difficult to share single-track trails because bikers believe they have the right of way and have been extremely rude to hikers. Hikers have become vulnerable to the abuse of the mountain bikers. Although all bikes are not malicious there are reasons for being in the mountains are not compatible with the reasons hikers are there. Hikers want quiet and tranquillity in order to enjoy their time in the mountains. Hikers want to enjoy nature; the flowers, birds and trees. This is not possible when bikers are speeding along the trails. This letter is to request that you do not open any more trails to mountain bikes and please consider closing the single-track trails that are already open. These are not safe for both hikers and bikers. (This same letter sent in by two other individuals.)

Having read the draft report, I am in almost 100% agreement with the equestrian and hiker user statements. I have had many negative encounters with bicyclists on the trails in Santa Monica Mountains. I do not want to use the trails that they use. Each trail that is opened to them is in essence closed to me. I find this unacceptable. Our reasons for using trails are incompatible. I need quiet and tranquillity, most bikers are in search of the thrill of the ride and consequently ride as fast and as aggressively as possible. I find it unthinkable to open additional trails to bicycles when there is so much discord between them and other individuals and groups of users. I am not so naive as to think that trails that are currently open to them will ever be closed, though that would be my first choice. I am convinced that opening any trails to them that are not currently open will only serve to spread the discord into areas where other users are now free to go. It will not alleviate the overcrowding sufficiently to make sharing trails with them acceptable. Even on trails that are now designated off-limits, I frequently encounter them or see their trails. Regarding "yield", as in "bikers yield to hikers and horses", this almost never happens. It is imperative that the parks publish in writing for distribution to all users a very precise and clear definition of the term so that all users understand exactly how to behave. I am opposed to changing the yield policy as recommended by the equestrian and hiker members of the team, but that approach is probably preferable to the status quo. The bicyclist member's contention that most people understand the term is erroneous. I support the trail runner's suggestion to enforce the common usage, though I am not hopeful as to its outcome. I believe the points made about the GGNRA court decision and the Congressman Beilenson's letter should be kept firmly in mind when making any decision about trail use in the Santa Monica Mountains.

I would like to express my strong belief that the trails in the Santa Monica Mountains are a precious resource which should be made available to all users. I know that some of the participants in the SMMART process have argued that the trails should be reserved for certain types of users. This argument is wrong for two reasons: 1) the parks are public resources and absent some compelling reason to the contrary, should be open to all methods of use. According to a survey published by AAA last year, bicycling is the 2nd most popular outdoor activity in America after camping. Americans are clamoring to use bicycles in their enjoyment of the great outdoors and in my view public officials should do all they can to accommodate this desire when formulating land use policies for publicly owned land. 2) I disagree with the arguments of a vocal minority of equestrians and hikers that bicycles cannot safely share the trails. I have been mountain biking for eight years. I slow for hikers and dismount for equestrians and my observation is that the majority of other bikers do the same. My experience is that most hikers and equestrians return that courtesy by expressing thanks, expressing greetings, etc. While there are those rude bikers who speed without regard to the other users, they are the exception and not the rule. This is proven by the fact that accidents between bikers and other users are very, very rare. These speeding bikers should be educated, not used as an excuse by the elitists to exclude the vast majority of bikers who ride safely. This is true for single track trails (which offer some of the most rewarding recreational value) as well as larger trails. It is my sincere hope that the bikes belong/share the trails vision will be adopted as a guiding principle in shaping trail access and future trail building. I know that [many people] have worked hard on the SMMART process and as a user of the Santa Monica Mountains trail system, I thank you.

The bikes are scary except on very wide trails. I totally support the Trail Running report, p. 80-82.

As a longtime hiker and nature enthusiast, I cannot support mountain bicycles on narrow trails. In addition to the erosion and damage they continually cause, they are dangerous to the walker, hiker, and horseback rider. The mountain bikes are mechanized and not really controllable, they are meant for speed, and that's what riders enjoy doing. Bikes are not meant for narrow trails. They are also dangerous to the rider themselves from what I've seen. It is obvious from the fact that they wear helmets. When hiking trails were built years ago, they were not built for trail bikes, but for walkers and equestrians. The difference

between equestrians and bikers is that there are very few equestrians as compared to bikers. The equestrians are also more considerate and do not travel at the great speeds the bikers do. The bikers have already overtaken the fire roads, leave the trails alone.

Critique of the TST user statements. Accessibility: I am in total agreement. Equestrian: [this report] mentions the two decade history of horses, but how important is this in 1997? I believe this is off little importance in deciding who will use the trails now. I would argue that horses are less nature friendly to trails and I find it amusing that not once in [this report] did he make claims of how bikes destroy trails. I wonder why not? I couldn't help but notice that the anti-bike activists like to use cliché buzzwords like "vehicles" and "machines" in reference to bikes, this is an old activist trick to play on one's emotions. I do hope that [SMMART] sees beyond this needless rhetoric. [This report] also mentions that a safety zone is needed free from civilization's influences, that would also mean free from horses. Hiking: [This report] also likes to use key buzzwords such as "historical" and "traditional" in referring to non-bike usage. "Historical" and "traditional" usage should not be a major determining factors here. [This report] is simply wrong when it states that "most single track trails will not stand up to heavy, sustained mountain bike use." The trails have, continue to, and will stand up. [The report] also mentions that "bikes, which are machines, have no right to trails." Well neither do hiking boots and sticks. Actually no one has the right to use public property any way they want to, only those that society deems privileged to. Mountain bicycling: I am in general agreement with [this report], however, I differ on a couple of issues. Trail yield signs should be changed. All should yield to horses and hikers should yield to bikes (I do when I hike and it doesn't bother me at all). It is so much easier and quicker for a hiker to simply step aside than it is for a biker to stop, dismount, walk by, remount and ride. Most hikers do this already without being asked to. It would be more than fair to create one or two bikes-only trails considering that there are so many trails closed to bikes. One way loop - that's the way. Trail running: I don't understand why we have a separate user group here. Do we also need a separate user group for trotting equestrians/full gallop equestrians and slow/fast mountain bikers? It's amazing that [this report is based] upon anti-bike court rulings in the San Francisco Bay Area. Some of the worst and most nonsensical decisions have hailed from San Francisco. General: Mountain bikers are now the single largest user group and outnumber all other user groups combined. Majority usage is of far more importance than historical and traditional users. I believe in shared usage over all. In time most other user groups' individuals will adapt to and accept this. I do believe that a fair amount of trails should be restricted area for bikes but no more than there is now. The Backbone Trail should be open to bikes for the full length. Serious consideration needs to be on parallel trails construction and more passing turnouts. Sullivan Canyon before the trails were bulldozed had just evolved to a point with many parallel trails that was just ripe for signage/usage experimentation. Please make decisions fairly.

Allocating trail use #1: There should be certain single track trails that cyclists can use somewhere. #6: Why should the park be viewed holistically? #7: Absolutely do not open all trails to bicycles. #8: Cyclist's comments are clearly wrong. The importance of width is it provides an escape when a cyclist careens around a corner. #11: Why can't there be certain designated [single track trails] where bikes are OK? The system in Zuma Canyon where mountain bikes use the Zuma Ridge Trail and offshoots, but are totally prohibited down in the canyon works well for the user groups. This conflict is akin to the conflict between skiers and snowboarders, where ski resorts are beginning to address it by having designated areas for aggressive snowboarders, keeping skiers out of harm's way. P.68 Table 4, potential criteria: # of dots, should be score or votes. P. 80, trail running, "district" should be "circuit".

As a horsewoman and hiker, I deplore the thought of sharing our narrow trails with bicycles. I consider it potentially life-threatening when I am on a horse and they are speeding towards me. Some of these people are very ignorant of the danger they are to others, perhaps having bought their bikes at a toy store. Not only do they represent a significant safety hazard, but they also diminish greatly my enjoyment of the serenity of nature. I do not appreciate my safety and enjoyment of the out-of-doors being compromised in this way. On the other hand, I feel fine about sharing very wide roads such as fire-roads with informed bicyclists. Let's all enjoy ourselves. Educate the buggers and keep 'em on wide roads only.

My overall impression is there is almost no user conflict in the parks. Like everyone else, I have encountered thoughtless users -hiking groups and runners that won't yield the trail, the speeding cyclist, the visitor that lets his/her dog off leash, the equestrian endurance riders who race along trails with no regard for other users. The overwhelming number of encounters are not just friendly, but usually involve enjoyable conversations. The philosophy and processes that foster and promote cooperation among all users can be guaranteed by through trail system construction, maintenance, and education for the benefit of all users. It is my observation, not my opinion, that shared use trails provide the most recreational opportunities for the most users. Clearly, some trails should be closed to bicycles. In the same vein, some trails should be closed to horses, pedestrians, and runners for the protection of cultural, natural, and planned resources as well as safety issues. The concept of close all trails to machines (bicycles) is absolutely inappropriate and contrary to the concept of fair/proportional/equitable trail allocation. All access rules, whatever they may be, should be applied equally to all user groups without regard to exemptions being made to any single group. The only exception is where harm may come to some portion of the land

in question and then the decision should be applied equally to all user groups. It seems to me that the greatest collective good comes from the philosophy, application, and design that provides for the opening of trails so that each user group can reach the backcountry of the various parks. Controls should also be placed in to operation. Programs such as volunteer patrols, youth programs, outreach the community through retailers, events and appropriate materials should be employed. [This] fosters cooperation among all park visitors, provides for the greatest uses and access to the parks, significantly reduces, if not eliminates systematic discrimination in, for, or against specific user groups. I would encourage you to adopt a "shared use trail" philosophy rather than restricting access to major trail user groups.

Bikes should be kept off single track trails.

I have been a trail runner for about seven years, and in that time have noted an obvious increase in both the number of and lack of trail courtesy from mountain bikers. This problem is most apparent on single-track trails (such as the single track that opened between Will Rogers and Temescal Canyon). Their excessive speeds and lack of consideration for hikers, runners, and the areas immediately surrounding narrow trails is a source of constant annoyance. I recognize the rights of cyclists to enjoy their sport; however, this should not be at the expense of other park users. I believe there is a need for an overall plan, limiting bike usage to fire roads and larger trails, in order for the two groups to peacefully co-exist.

I suggest restricting times/dates for trail use by mountain bikes which do not co-exist with hikers, runners, and equestrians. It is difficult to relax and enjoy riding when you constantly have to peer behind to check for bikes.

I wish to express my support for continuing to allow mountain bikes in the Santa Monica Mountains. I enjoy riding in this area and respect the trails and other uses (such as hikers and equestrians).

Without a doubt, bicycles must be kept off the single track trails. Bicycles are OK on fire roads, but there are just too dangerous, destructive and disruptive for the single track trails. These high tech machines are designed to give the rider maximum mechanical advantage over the elements. The elements lost every time. They are destroying the resources represented by the parks. While it is true the final result of this whole process will be purely non-binding recommendations to agencies of different jurisdictions with different agendas and budgets, somehow, something must be done to protect the other users and the trails themselves from the bikers. Its way out of control and getting worse. Somehow there needs to be enforceable rules, and then there needs to be enforcement effective in keeping bikes off the single tracks. Machines have proven to be just too destructive and too dangerous. Over and over again, the naturally borne trail users observe these machines trashing the environment and terrorizing the other users. Its got to stop.

I feel bikes belong/share the trails has not been voiced enough. I'm out there and I know mountain biking is able to share the trails and do so with little or no harm. The multiple use principle should be used on both new and existing trails. I believe they can be shared by pedestrians, equestrians, and cyclists alike. New trails should include cyclists so linking trails to existing trails are multi-use also. Hike/bike trail camps should be set up along the Backbone Trail and closed trails should be opened to bikes. We can't lock out one taxpayer so one group can have sole access. By working with the park rangers all problems can be dealt with and addressed to meet the needs of all users. We have had mountain bike events with CORBA/MBU where they help educate riders on trail safety and multi-use rules. In 5 years of this event we have had no injuries. I hope to never be locked out of trails due to closed mindedness. We need to think of how this will effect our future and how best to use our resources. All peoples' needs should be met, not special interest groups.

Please keep our trails open to all users. I will personally become more involved in trail usage and will help endorse smart trail usage, i.e., use a bell, slow down near all animals, hikers, equestrians, etc. I am a member of CORBA/IMBA. We need to treat all of the trail systems as a shared resource and all trail use should unite. I endorse coordinated planning and cooperative problem solving. All trail users should share maintaining trails and trail cooperation. Having the opportunity to ride and enjoy these trails is part of the reason I bought a new home in the Thousand Oaks area. I pay a lot of property taxes, but would be willing to pay more taxes to maintain the trails or possibly a user fee or something. Can't we all just get along?

Open all trails.

It has been my experience that the vast majority of trail users in this area are mountain bikers and hikers that enjoy sharing the trails together. In fact, I have only encountered a couple of irresponsible bike riders and a couple of intolerant hikers. I urge you and the participating agencies to expand the sharing of trail access in order to best serve the majority of trail users. Access to trails like the Will Rogers are a wonderful experience for mountain bikers. I recommend that the entire Backbone Trail should be open to mountain bikers including the proposed campsites, or at least some of them. I do not object to designating some of the narrow and rugged trails for hiking only, but I do object to the bicycle ban proposals made by a very small and extremist group of hikers. Also, I'm proud to be a member of CORBA and I believe that their volunteer patrols have done a lot to improve responsible biking and relations with other trail users. [Excerpted from a letter.]

I would classify myself as a part time outdoor person as I spend most of my time in the work place, however, in my off hours I try to spend quality time on the trails and around the Santa Monica Mountains trails, hiking and mountain bicycling. I read

and reviewed the draft report on the Santa Monica Mountains trails report and see what seems to be personal animosity between various user groups, however I sincerely believe this is the results of isolated incidents (horse spooked by mountain biker, runner steps in horse dropping, hiker yelled at by runner, hiker sics dog on mountain biker, etc.) that these group try to justify exclusive use of trails for themselves. I found in the various comments submitted in the draft that the mountain bicycling group encourages sharing, provides remedies for maintaining, linking, and use of all trails without restricting the trails to anybody. I do not think public trails should be restricted to any one user group or groups and encourage that any changes be made with the understanding that the decisions made were based on the best suggestions and considerations submitted by all user groups.

I'm absolutely impressed with the detail put into the whole process. I'll just put in a predictable and strong vote for the bikes belong/share the trail vision.

No vehicles. People and animals only please. Keep all wheels off trails, please, please, please.

Only people and horses on trails, please. No wheels of any kind.

Since bicycles on trails diminish the enjoyment of hikers in proportion to the number of bicycles encountered, numbers of bicycles need to be limited. Probably an impossible regulation. But without limitation, a trail can become unusable by hikers without enjoyment (some already have). Thus, the only logical position to take is that since uncontrolled use by bikers ruins hikers' enjoyment and since bicycle use, once allowed, cannot be controlled, bicycles should not be allowed on hiking trails.

We attended the SMMART open house and enjoyed meeting the new Santa Monica Mountains NRA Superintendent and the other park officials in attendance. We were impressed by their dedication, but were very concerned by the prospect of the hazards of mountain bikers in the Santa Monica Mountains NRA! It appears that mountain bikers who are the single greatest liability in our parks and natural areas, have been lobbying hard to inappropriately open the parks up further to their undesirable activities. I, and friends, have been brushed by mountain bikers speeding by on fire roads on several occasions, and, have almost been hit by mountain bikers on numerous occasions, scaring the heck out of us and ruining our day's outing! Mountain bikers are using our parks as their own race track and their own motocross jumping course and this needs to stop! Mountain bikers activity needs to be severely limited in our parks as an avocation grossly inappropriate in a park setting. They are a dangerous group and just because they inappropriately want to use the trails, does not mean anyone should capitulate to them and allow them to do so!

We support the effort to reconcile a variety of perspective on single trail usage and appreciated the concluding statements from each user group. Consensus on this issue will require further efforts by all participants. Reports from some individuals who initially came to meetings suggests than an atmosphere where all voices could be heard and respected was lacking during this process. When the dialogue resumes, stronger facilitation encouraging all participants to be heard and establishing firm guidelines for dealing with disagreements will be necessary. We support the recommendation on p. 82 that each single track trail be evaluated for environmental impacts, public safety and user compatibility before being opened to multiple uses. By far the most contentious part of this process, multiple use guidelines remains unresolved. We support the efforts of all agencies and interested trail users to continue the process of working towards a set of guidelines that provide adequate environmental protection, ensure public safety, and resolve the bitter differences regarding trail use.

Please don't let pressure from wealthy horse owners and others who want the Santa Monica Mountains trails all to themselves influence you to ban mountain biking. Bikes do belong. Let's share the trails.

I want single track trails for runners only!

Bikers ruin the quiet enjoyment of riding and running through the hills. The speed and disregard shown for others by bikers is dangerous and unsettling.

A 15 mph speed limit on multi-track trails is too high for bicycles in the Santa Monica Mountains . The speed limit should be set at 10 mph! At 15 mph a bicycle travels 22 feet in one second and carries a potentially lethal collision energy. Issues of laws, rules, signage, trail width, enforcement, yield priorities, courtesy, etc. are of small moment to a hiker faced with the potential of a confrontation with a fast bicycle. The hiker knows who bears the burden of assuring his/her own safety. 15 mph is a motor vehicle speed. An enforced 10 mph speed park trail limit would carry the message "no thrill riding on multi-track trails." It would convert dangerously high-speed bicyclists into obvious outlaws. It would reduce the collision energy at the speed limit by more than 50%, it would enhance bicycle maneuverability by more than a factor of two, it could substantially mitigate the terror of bicycles experienced by hikers, it might even induce hikers who have essentially abandoned single-track trails to return to them.

As I read through the SMMART report, I was extremely pleased at the amount of positive data and recommendations from the various teams. It is exciting to learn about greater opportunities for use and enjoyment of the backcountry. When I reached the TST report it was like changing the channel from NPR to talk radio. Where is the documentation for all of the complaints

and anti-bike rhetoric of the hiker, equestrian, and trail runner? Their reports may be their individual visions of reality but they do not represent reality as I see it. Nor are they the reality of most of the people I talk to and most of the reports that I read. Wherever I ride, I ask virtually every equestrian I encounter how they get along with cyclists. Most say something like, "just fine, except for a jerk now and then." Hikers are generally quite friendly, particularly when we exchange a word or two about bird watching or how nice it is to be where we are. But there are exceptions. I have encountered some of the rudest people imaginable, trail runners on missions of personal fitness, hikers with chips on their shoulders, drunken equestrians running their horses. Their attitude and their actions have been totally anti-social and sometimes dangerous. They are a small percentage, just like the small percentage of cyclists who act like jerks. What I want from the Santa Monica Mountains is more cycling opportunities, not less. We need more loop trails and more connector trails (not every trail!). Jurisdictions adjoining yours have seen fit to increase opportunities for cyclists. I don't see any reason why the NPS shouldn't follow suit. If there is some wealth of information supporting the complaints and claims of the [hiker, equestrian and runner representatives] would you please send it to me or advise me where I can get it?

I would like the trails to be kept open for runners, not bikers.

I would prefer that mountain bikers did not exist where I'm hiking and especially at blind corners on trails and (even faster) fire roads. But the fact is there are not a lot of hikers/people away from the major entrance areas (e.g., Malibu Creek park and the beach areas). In times of tight budgets we need a strong and unified constituency to lobby for funds to maintain and expand public lands in the Santa Monica Mountains. So I believe that hikers and bikers (and equestrians and runners and limited access users) need to be more compromising with each other in order to forge a more unified front for advocacy of park funds. A key element to maintaining tranquillity within the uneasy alliance is for there to be spot enforcement activity by uniformed park semic personnel along trails and fire roads.

Mountain bikes do not leave droppings and do not go as fast as a galloping horse. Bikes can certainly stop a whole lot faster. Having seen first hand the incredible damage horses have done to the Sierras (giardia, etc.) I doubt the conclusions re damage by bikes. I have also noted that bikes do not themselves erode (cause erosion) - rain does that! Also bikes don't kick or bite persons that get close and bikes always do what the rider commands - unlike horses. In no way can a 25 lb. bicycle cause the damage or be as great a hazard as a 2000 lb. horse with steel shoes.

I support the concept of open, multi-use trails available to equestrians, hikers, and bicyclists. Shared use trails provide greater recreational opportunities and do not unfairly exclude existing user groups. I am both a hiker and a mountain biker. I believe that each is a legitimate form of recreation. Proposed restrictions to mountain biking access is unnecessary. Impacts from bicycles are not significantly different than hikers. In addition, concerns over the dangers of mountain biking appear to be based on subjective reports, rather than a review of impartial trail usage data. All activities in the backcountry have inherent risks that need to be considered by the users. Through proper trail construction, maintenance, and education, risk to all users will be minimized. All major trails in the Santa Monica mountains, including the Backbone Trail, should be shared use. In addition, most single-track trails should be accessible to mountain bicyclists. I believe that through open access and ongoing education, the Santa Monica Mountains will remain a viable place for all people to experience the outdoors while ensuring the safety of park visitors and protection of the environment.

Bikes should only be allowed on double track roads. They have wheels are therefore a machine and can be operated in careless manners, i.e., excessive speeds! Speed limits and rules of the road should be posted and activities of bikers should be monitored. Bikers today are a threat to horses and hikers wherever they go because they observe no rules in terms of where they go - often do not call out they are passing (as they come up from the rear of foot travelers), blast down trails (Will Rogers and Eagle Springs road where there is a blind corner and they could care not who might be coming along) and travel in packs which causes hikers to gasp for air because of the dirt and dust flying into the air. Bikers are out for a thrill of speed and daring and from what I have experienced care nothing for hikers or the environment.

I find it interesting how the largest users, mountain bikers, are the most welcoming. I, as a mountain biker believe, like many others, that all users should use all trails. However, hikers, runners, equestrians (as a group - a minority user of the trails) believe they should be the only trail users and mountain bikes should be banned on all trails. I don't believe any one user group should be able to dictate or limit the others use of the trail system, especially when they represent a fraction of all trail users. I think communication as well as a yield hierarchy will substantially improve user concerns. What I mean by communication is for users to talk with each other when they are approaching to inform the other where they are and where they are going. How hard is it for a user to do this, it would solve many people's concerns. God forbid you talk to a stranger in Los Angeles. For the yield hierarchy, the TST should determine which user should yield to who and under what circumstances, and they maybe produce signs and flyers explaining the yield hierarchy. I find it disheartening that a trail user would want to restrict another users' enjoyment of public lands. I understand that safety is the largest concern for hikers, runners, and equestrians, but prohibiting mountain bikers is not the answer, especially when mountain bikers are the largest user of the trails. I feel the answer is communication and understanding.

Bicyclists should not be allowed on single track trails. It is too dangerous to hikers and equestrians. Rules should be established for speed limits and trail courtesy such as warning people of bicyclist approach, particularly from the rear.

Again, I believe it will be impossible to accommodate multiple types of users on a common trail. Right now on trails that are used jointly, bicycles must yield to hikers, but they do not do so. I hike in the Santa Monica Mountains several times a week and only once has a biker dismounted to allow me to pass. I have always been the one to leap out of the way. Since bicycles were allowed on my favorite hiking trail (Will Rogers) I have not returned to hike there. I feel that I've been chased out by the bikers. It is no longer safe or enjoyable to hike there. Also the bikers are riding narrow trails that are off limits to them. Is there funding to police the mountain trails? Bicycles are wheeled vehicles and should be allowed where other wheeled vehicles are allowed. In the mountains they should not be allowed beyond the fire roads. I am convinced that if they are allowed on some narrow trails that ultimately they will be on all narrow trails. (How will they be kept off?) Where will the hikers go? To be equitable, give the fire roads to the bicycles and the narrow trails to the hikers. As the hikers have to use the fire roads to get to some of the hiking trails (narrow) trails, I believe some of the arrangements could be made for that as fire roads are so much wider than hiking trails. Let's keep bicycles off of the narrow trails!

[Agrees with the agreed upon options] because they are sensible. Supports improving signage, strict enforcement of laws and rules, and selective/multiple use access options. These options would help create the effect people go to the parks for. Peace of mind, let worries go and relaxation.

An obvious omission from the TST is the lack of anyone representing the natural areas that trails pass through. Was there any effort made to obtain input from such groups as Audubon Society, CA Native Plant Society, or other educational institutions? Among the nature-related benefits of trails are: 1) greater accessibility for nature study; 2) openings in chaparral canopy which promotes greater floral diversity; 3) animals use the trails to move through the park. On the other hand, traffic on trails can be a significant deterrent to nature study. Dust covers the vegetation along trails heavily used by bicycles. Substantial traffic can disturb wildlife and interfere with their activities. Just who on the team speaks for the flora and fauna? It is obvious from reading the summary and my own experience that the main problem is the conflict between off-road vehicle users and everyone else. This conflict is a result of basic incompatibility between the different types of trail usage, which no amount of education or desensitization can eliminate. One of the main reasons is that bicycles are inherently dangerous. That's why cyclists wear crash helmets! The primary result of multiple-use trails is to drive away non-cyclists. Two of my favorite hiking areas used to be Sycamore Canyon and Cheseboro Canyon. However I rarely use either place anymore. Trail damage is another problem created mainly by bicycles. In dry seasons, trails are pulverized to dust and there is a permanent haze in such heavily used areas as Sycamore Canyon. It is clear that trail sharing between cyclists and non-cyclists is not a reasonable alternative. Either bicycles must go, or they must be segregated from other users. (The disappearance of hikers from heavily used bicycle trails is a form of de facto segregation, but not a welcome one). Some have suggested that bicycles be banned from single track trails. I do not object to such a proposal, I don't think it seriously addresses the problem for the following reasons: 1) park agencies can't begin to enforce such a ban on all the single track trails in the mountains; 2) relatively few park users can be found on single-track trails. Most of the interaction between cyclists and non-cyclists occurs on the main park roads. 3) Almost all of my own unpleasant encounters with bicycles have occurred on roads, not single track trails. In general, cyclists ride faster on roads than on single track trails and speed is the principal problem with bicycles. A better way to share trails, if they must be shared at all, is through the use of on-off days for bicycles. Certain days of the week certain parks would be alternately closed completely to bicycles. This would require some coordination between park agencies so that there would always be plenty of places to bike on any given day. But there would also be plenty of bike-free areas for other users, even in the most popular areas of the most popular parks (something which is not true currently). In order to gain the cycling community's support for such a proposal, I would suggest that when cyclists are permitted in a park, they have access to all park trails, subject to the following conditions: 1) natural values along the trails are not jeopardized. 2) trails can be adequately maintained, which is certainly not the case at present (if more cyclists volunteered to maintain trails they might become more sensitive to the damage that bikes can do), trails which are clearly not safe for bicycles should remain closed. This proposal was rejected by the hiking and biking representatives as unworkable. But it seems to me that closing a single park to bicycles on a given day is far easier to implement than enforcing the current policy of piecemeal regulations on bicycle access or the proposal to ban bicycles from all single-track trails. And it's a lot safer!

As an avid runner and native Californian, I am disturbed at the idea of modifying our beautiful, natural Santa Monica Mountain trails. Perhaps trails could be labeled as a bike trail, hiking trail, etc. and this label could be changed daily or weekly. Enforcement would be on the honor system. After all, we all want (and often need) to enjoy our beautiful surroundings!

I am a trail runner. I have no problem with sharing the trail with others - hikers, horses, bikes, etc. However, single track trails should be restricted to hikers and runners. Bicycles are a hazard on these trails.

I understand that some trail users involved in SMMART are asking to limit mountain biking access to mountain trails even further. This truly is an elitist attitude on their part. Mountain biking is a safe, environmentally sound activity that is shared by many Americans. We all cherish backcountry treks on single-track trails for all the obvious reasons. It is sad to see that a few vocal extremists don't care for our type of recreation and feel that we have no right to share the trail system. It is hard to understand what motivates their selfishness. My personal experiences with other types of trail users have been nothing but positive. I understand some bikers have been accused of riding recklessly on the trails. I'm sure that these bikers do exist, but they are not the norm by any means. I would like to see more trails open to bicycling. I know of many bicyclists that have been

nearly abandoned by hiking and equestrian communities, yet cyclists are denied access for no apparent reason. A great example is the Backbone section between Stunt Road and Las Virgenes Road. This section was closed to cyclists some years ago and now sees very little use if any. We'd love to have it back instead of seeing it go to waste. How about building new trails for everyone to enjoy? There are several areas in our trail system that cyclists are forced to use busy sections of pavement to complete a loop.

Here in Orange County, we enjoy access to a trail system comprised of mostly shared-use trails. In 1990 the County created a Citizens Advisory Committee for Riding and Hiking Trails. This committee, comprised of representatives from each of the major user groups (hikers, equestrians and cyclists) re-wrote the recreational element of the County's master plan and recommended a policy where all trails were open to all users unless closed for cause. Today, the overwhelming majority of trails, including single track, remain "shared-use". In 1992, the Trails Council of Orange County formed with the emphasis on working together to build and maintain trails. Many of our parks and trails have been co-adopted by hikers with mountain bicyclists or mountain bicyclists working with equestrians. Our track record over the past several years in a densely populated and congested part of the state clearly demonstrates that shared-use trails work just fine.

I am a frequent hiker of the Santa Monica Mountains trails. When I heard of plans to ban bicyclists from the trails I was extremely concerned. Several of my friends, as well as my dad, are avid mountain bicyclists. For them, these are the closest trails of escape from the daily grind of Los Angeles. To take that away from them because of a few complaining hikers is unfair. Let's face it, beautiful terrain like the Santa Monica Mountains is not easily found in a highly populated area like LA. Therefore, we must be willing to share such beauty and compromise. As a hiker, I am willing to follow a few basic rules of courtesy, as are all of my mountain biking friends in order to better accommodate all trail users. Signs reading "Bicyclists stay right-hikers stay left" may be one solution. The solution seems simple, we must all work together. Please keep the trails open to bicyclists and hikers alike. Beauty should be shared not owned.

I recognize the enormous effort and hours invested in this report. I was somewhat involved. There are many points of agreement and they need to be stated. However, the single salient point remains: if you allow bicycles on the single track trails you violate the spirit of the park and the intention of the creators. The mechanical intrusion can make what should be a positive outdoor experience into a negative, even humble experience for the other users. If you give the trails to the bikes, no matter what you say, you take the trails away from everyone else.

I think speed and passing regulations need to be established and enforced. Bikers take away from the serene atmosphere with the parks, drastically reducing the trail use experience.

Please leave the single-track trails open for runners and hikers. No mountain bikes.

I agree with the points that the team came to agreement on. In addition, I agree with all of the proposed physical improvements and disagree with all of the proposed new regulations on trail use except the guided visits to sensitive areas and better enforcement. Most of the allocating trail use proposal appeared petty and directed against one user group or another. Rather than implementing one group's pet peeves or anothers' let's look at making all trail use as inclusive as possible and only exclude a user group if a particular trail cannot accommodate their use well. This is the only sensible and fair approach. There are plenty of trails that cannot accommodate (or even be made to accommodate) bicycles or equestrians or disabled citizens well. This should be self-evident. All 5 proposals for mitigating/reducing conflict appear appropriate to help reduce friction and increase awareness and understanding among all users. I do not have any new proposal that would provide any breakthroughs. Let's work with what we have.

